

fit of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

203. By Mr. COLE: Petition of Bucyrus, Ohio, Division No. 193, Order of Railway Conductors, protesting against sales or turnover tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

204. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Messrs. W. J. Nicholson, A. G. Prouty, and E. H. Amstutz, jewelers of Napa, Calif., indorsing a 1 per cent gross sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

205. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Conrad & Co., E. T. Slattery Co., A. Stowell & Co., and C. Crawford Hollidge, all of Boston, Mass., favoring a sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

206. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition from voters of Oshkosh, Wis., desiring the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

207. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of residents of forty-first district of New York, protesting against tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

208. Also, petition of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, protesting against proposed sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

209. Also, petition of Wildroot Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against proposed tax on tin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

210. Also, petition of the Lest We Forget Committee of New York, protesting against tax on tin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

211. By Mr. MONTROYA: Resolution by New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, regarding State control of public domain and Indian live stock; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

212. Also, petition of the New Mexico Wool Growers' Association, asking suspension of existing freight rates until July, pending permanent readjustment of same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

213. Also, petition of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, regarding appropriation for destruction of predatory wild animals and range-destroying rodents; to the Committee on Appropriations.

214. Also, petition of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, favoring pure-fabric legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

215. Also, petition of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, regarding long-time loans to owners of breeding stock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

216. By Mr. MORIN: Twenty-four petitions bearing hundreds of names of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of beer and light wines and in opposition to Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

217. By Mr. SPROUL: Petitions of 308 citizens of the third congressional district of Illinois, protesting against the enactment of so-called Sunday blue laws and asking the amendment of the prohibition act to permit the sale of beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

218. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of S. H. Reynolds Sons Co., of Boston, Mass., concerning Senate bill 4927; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

219. Also, petition of Lockwood, Brackett & Co., of Boston, Mass., concerning ad valorem duties on imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

220. Also, petition of F. C. Henderson Co., of Boston, Mass., concerning revision of existing tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

221. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., for repeal of 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

222. Also, petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians, through its national secretary, petitioning for recognition of the republic of Ireland by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

223. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., for the recognition of the republic of Ireland by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

224. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of New Castle Division, No. 326, Order of Railway Conductors, representing the railway conductors employed on the Erie and Ashtabula division of the Pennsylvania Railroad, protesting against the repeal of the excess-profits tax and the enactment of a sales or turnover tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

225. Also, protest of Tin City Division, No. 565, Mahoningtown, Pa., against the enactment of a sales-tax law and the repeal of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

226. Also, petition of F. C. Doeschmer, of Pittsburgh, Pa., requesting the repeal of tax on furs and advocating the adoption of the proposed sales tax or turnover tax law of 1 per cent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

227. Also, petition of Edwin R. Dodge, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting repeal of tax on fur goods and supporting the enactment of a gross sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

228. Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., supporting the proposal to incorporate in tariff legislation what are known as bargaining provisions, in order that the Executive may have the means of taking defensive measures against the products of any country which discriminates against American products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

229. Also, resolution of the Chartiers Valley Central Labor Union, of Canonsburg, Pa., indorsing the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

230. Also, resolutions of Chartiers Valley Central Labor Union, Canonsburg, Pa., demanding the immediate release and the granting of amnesty to all persons whose political beliefs formed the basis of their imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

231. Also, petitions from Henry Newman and others, of Cross Creek Township, Washington County, Pa., and American Flint Glass Workers' Local Union, No. 25, Rochester, Pa., protesting against the enactment of the Capper-Fess bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 21, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that Thou hast told us in Thy Word that they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint. Grant that this may be to us not simply an expression of Scriptural truth but a realization in our hearts and lives, so that we may realize that as the day is so shall our strength be. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, containing a statement of files of papers which are not needed in the transaction of business of the Department of Labor and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Vice President appointed Mr. KENYON and Mr. JONES of New Mexico members of the committee on the part of the Senate and ordered that the Secretary of the Senate notify the House of Representatives thereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2185) providing for a "Pageant of Progress Exposition" cancellation stamp to be used by the Chicago post office, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of St. Johns Division, No. 196, Order of Railway Conductors, of Jacksonville, Fla., remonstrating against the passage of a sales tax law and the repeal of the excess-profits tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Anthony, Ocala, Kendrick, and Sparr, all in the State of Florida, remonstrating against any increase in tariff on coal-tar products used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants by farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of 251 citizens of New York and New Jersey praying for the enactment of legislation for the recognition of the Irish republic, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MOSES presented a petition of Abigail Webster Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, of Franklin, N. H., praying for the enactment of House bill 2412, known as the Daughters of the American Revolution old trails act, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. KEYES presented a petition of Abigail Webster Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, of Franklin, N. H., praying for the enactment of House bill 2412, known as the Daughters of the American Revolution old trails act, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the American National Live Stock Association at its recent convention held in El Paso, Tex., favoring the abolition of war and excess-profits taxes and surtaxes on the income of individuals, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I present a communication from the Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce, of Hyannis, Mass., with reference to the Cape Cod Canal. It is a very short communication, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

ADOPTED BY CAPE COD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Voted that the Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce, in general meeting of membership at Hyannis, April 14, 1921, are of the opinion that the development of the Cape Cod Canal is a project of the greatest potential importance to the welfare of Cape Cod, and therefore our representatives in the Congress, the Hon. CALVIN COOLIDGE, Vice President; Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE and Hon. DAVID I. WALSH, United States Senators; and the Hon. JOSEPH WALSH, Congressman, be requested to take this matter under consideration, with a view to hastening such pending action of the Federal Government, whose delay is adversely affecting this whole region.

It is of the utmost importance that boats passing through the canal on daily trips between New York and Boston should stop near the western entrance of the canal, and this, we understand, can not be arranged until the final disposition of the canal is determined.

Mr. WALSH of Montana presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 3, enacted by the seventeenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Jos. M. Dixon, governor of said State, on the 23d day of February, 1921.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 24th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Senate joint resolution 3.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas there was granted to the State of Montana by the United States large tracts of timberland within said State for educational purposes; and

Whereas by the terms of said grant it was provided that said lands "shall be disposed of only at public sale and at a price not less than \$10 per acre, the proceeds to constitute a permanent school fund"; and

Whereas pursuant to the laws of the State of Montana the State has sold and disposed of the timber from a large acreage of the said timberlands, and the lands so cut over are valuable only as timberlands and for timber culture and have no value for agriculture or other purposes, and that it is to the interests of the State of Montana and the educational institutions for which said lands were granted that said cut-over lands be reforested; and

Whereas said cut-over lands are widely scattered and in most cases isolated, and by reason thereof it is impracticable and uneconomic to undertake the reforestation and care thereof, and that in order that this important work may be successfully carried on the State should be permitted to exchange said cut-over lands that are valuable only for timber culture for other lands of like character and of the same value, to the end that the State may acquire or secure its holdings in a compact body in order that reforestation may be undertaken in a businesslike and economic manner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (the house of representatives concurring), That we, the Seventeenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to immediately enact such legislation as will permit the State of Montana to dispose of the cut-over timberlands heretofore granted by exchange, so that a reforestation program may be successfully and economically carried out by said State of Montana; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana in Congress, and that they be urged to use their best efforts to obtain congressional action herein indicated.

NELSON STORY, Jr.,
President of the Senate.
FRED L. GIBSON,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 23, 1921.

JOS. M. DIXON, Governor.

Filed February 23, 1921, at 3.20 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART, Secretary of State.

CENTENNIAL OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF PERU.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the message of the President of the United States in relation to the celebration of the centennial of the independence of Peru, reported a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) creating a commission to represent the United States in the celebration of the first centennial of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Peru, which was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HEFLIN:

A bill (S. 1031) for the relief of Eugene K. Stoudemire; and A bill (S. 1032) for the relief of Maj. Francis M. Maddox, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 1033) regulating the issuance of checks, drafts, and orders for the payment of money within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 1034) to establish a game sanctuary in the watershed of the South Fork of the Flathead River, in the Flathead National Forest, to perpetuate a breeding place for game animals; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. STANFIELD:

A bill (S. 1035) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pendleton, Oreg., one German cannon or field-piece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 1036) to extend the provisions of the existing bounty land laws to the officers and enlisted men and officers and men of the boat companies of the Florida Seminole war; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1037) to designate Tampa, Fla., as a port at which a marine school may be established and maintained under the act of Congress approved March 4, 1911; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 1038) granting a pension to Francisco Giron; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1039) for the public protection of maternity and infancy and providing a method of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BORAH (by request):

A bill (S. 1040) authorizing the appointment of Anthony John Tittinger as captain of Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1041) to provide for the establishment, operation, management, and control of an agricultural capital or central clearing house for the scientific distribution and marketing of agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1042) to provide for the incorporation of cooperative associations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1043) granting a pension to James Green;

A bill (S. 1044) granting a pension to Mary Ann Sheffer;

A bill (S. 1045) granting a pension to Brittian Capril Smith;

A bill (S. 1046) granting an increase of pension to Anna J. Shepherd;

A bill (S. 1047) granting a pension to James Reynolds;

A bill (S. 1048) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ross;

A bill (S. 1049) granting a pension to Mattie Florence Sinclair;

A bill (S. 1050) granting a pension to Lydia Roach;

A bill (S. 1051) granting a pension to Kate Lamaster;

A bill (S. 1052) granting a pension to William McClure;

A bill (S. 1053) granting a pension to James H. Pipes;

A bill (S. 1054) granting an increase of pension to John Hiet;

A bill (S. 1055) granting a pension to Claude H. Johnson;

A bill (S. 1056) granting a pension to Anna B. Tegler; and

A bill (S. 1057) to pension survivors of certain Indian wars, disturbances, and campaigns from January 1, 1850, to January 1, 1891; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1058) granting a pension to Dennis B. Shuey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1059) for the relief of J. B. Waterman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1060) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce," approved October 29, 1919; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1061) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education, to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries, to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects, and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure," approved February 23, 1917; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1062) to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 1063) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Charlotte W. Miller*; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1064) granting a pension to James Moran; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have just received a bill from the Treasury Department with reference to the Coast Guard, which I introduce for reading and proper reference. I ask that the letter accompanying it may be printed and also referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1065) to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades in the same proportions as provided by law for the distribution in grades of commissioned line officers of the Navy, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper ordered to be printed); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 1066) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Piney Branch Road, between Seventeenth and Taylor Streets and Sixteenth and Allison Streets NW., rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening and extension of streets called for in the permanent highway plan of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNOX (by request):

A bill (S. 1067) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Henry A. Laughlin and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 1068) for the relief of Ingvald A. Knudsen;
A bill (S. 1069) for the relief of Federal Line (Inc.);
A bill (S. 1070) for the relief of Federal Line (Inc.); and
A bill (S. 1071) for the relief of Harold Bentsen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 1072) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1073) for the relief of Lewis Clarke Lucas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIAL:

A bill (S. 1074) to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 1075) giving permanent rank to district superintendents of the Coast Guard on the retired list; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 1076) establishing standard grades of naval stores, preventing deception in transactions in naval stores, regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BORAH (by request):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to provide for the reimbursements to the Eastern and Emigrant Cherokees by blood for lands allotted to the Negro freedmen (among the Cherokees) from the lands granted to the Eastern and Emigrant Cherokees by blood under treaty of 1835, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the other day I introduced a bill (S. 597) providing for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes, and asked that it might lie over as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] was absent. I have conferred with him, and he has no objection to the reference of the bill to the Committee on Commerce. A similar bill was introduced in the Fifty-third Congress and another of like import in the Fifty-fourth Congress, and both were referred to the Committee on Commerce. It seems to be the usual practice to refer bills of this character to that committee. The Senator from Pennsylvania has no objection to such a reference in this case, and I ask that it may be so referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2185) providing for a "Pageant of Progress Exposition" cancellation stamp to be used by the Chicago post office was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

CLASSIFICATION OF DEPARTMENTAL EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is on the table the bill (S. 13) to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field service, for the standardization of compensation therefor, and for other purposes, which has been read twice by its title. The question is on the reference of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gerry	Lodge	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McCormick	Shortridge
Borah	Harris	McCumber	Smith
Brandeggee	Harrison	McKinley	Smoot
Bursum	Heflin	McNary	Spencer
Calder	Hitchcock	Myers	Stanfield
Cameron	Johnson	Nelson	Sterling
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Trammell
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Nicholson	Underwood
Culberson	Kellogg	Norris	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kendrick	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Kenyon	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	Keyes	Pittman	Warren
Ernst	King	Poinexter	Weller
Fernald	Knox	Pomerene	Willis
Fletcher	Ladd	Reed	
France	La Follette	Robinson	

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] on official business.

Mr. HARRIS. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. WATSON of Georgia] is necessarily absent from the Senate because of suffering occasioned by an accident to his arm.

Mr. STERLING. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. NORBECK] on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONFIRMATION OF GEORGE HARVEY.

Mr. HARRISON and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, on Saturday the Senate in executive session considered the nomination of Col. George Harvey as ambassador to the Court of St. James, at London.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for a question.

Mr. STERLING. I merely wish to know the present situation here, and whether the Senator from Utah yields to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HARRISON. I was recognized by the Chair and have the floor in my own right.

Mr. SMOOT. The Chair recognized the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, ordinarily under the rules of the Senate I would not be permitted to discuss what took place in that executive session or explain the vote that I cast on the confirmation of that nomination. By the action of the Senate, however, while in executive session, it was unanimously agreed that the votes of Senators on that confirmation

be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, since the lids of secrecy have been removed to that extent, I am therefore at liberty to state the reasons that prompted me to vote in the negative on the confirmation.

The nomination of Col. Harvey to this very important post was of such interest to the country that I was of the opinion that it should be considered in open executive session. Accordingly, not only did I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in open executive session but when an objection was made to that request I moved that it be considered in open executive session. I know not, except that the custom and precedents of the Senate should be followed, why objection was made.

It is well-known that to this nomination there was very strong opposition, not only upon the part of Senators in the minority but there was a smoldering opposition upon the part of many Senators on the other side of the aisle. It was a nomination of such peculiar making and such potential import that the country had a right to know the underlying facts that prompted the nomination and the influence that brought about its confirmation.

In ordinary times when the countries of the world were not entangled by delicate international complications the appointment of ambassador to this high diplomatic post would be a matter of great concern not only to the American people but to the peoples of the world. It is natural, therefore, to suppose that a greater exercise of prudence, a more careful discretion, a more painstaking consideration should be exercised in the consideration of such an appointment at this time when the whole international structure of the world is being adjusted, when our diplomatic associations are most strained, and in international affairs we are looked upon with suspicion. I know of no official position in the life of this Nation to-day, with the exception of the Presidency and the Secretary of State, that carries with it greater import to the peoples of the world than the ambassadorship to the Court of St. James.

From the foundation of our Government until this good hour America has had just cause to feel proud of the character of men that have represented her in the capitals of the world. Especially has it reason to be proud of the great men, so well equipped and qualified for the peculiar tasks to which they had been assigned, who have been designated throughout our history to represent us at the Court of St. James. It has been an extraordinary succession of polished gentlemen, able diplomats, and distinguished statesmen—James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Albert Gallatin, Martin Van Buren, Edward Everett, George Bancroft, Abbott Lawrence, James Buchanan, Charles Francis Adams, John Lothrop Motley, James Russell Lowell, Edward J. Phelps, Thomas F. Bayard, John Hay, Joseph H. Choate, Whitelaw Reid, Walter Page, and John W. Davis.

It is a long and distinguished list of brilliant names that have reflected honor upon the country.

It is my purpose, Mr. President, to give my reasons briefly why I did not believe in the confirmation of this nomination and thereby adding to the list the name of George Harvey.

I shall not in this discussion question the journalistic ability of Col. Harvey—a ready talker, and a fluent writer whose words and expressions are at times as violent as the raging gusts of a tornado or the angry waves of a storm-swept sea. Educational qualifications and strong intellectual attainments are attributes that might qualify one for service in one field of labor, but when those qualities are influenced by other attributes they may destroy their effectiveness in other fields. Few men in the history of journalism have possessed to a more remarkable degree qualities of genius for violent expression, caustic criticism, and the power through fair or foul means to employ cogent phrases intended to appeal to prejudice and to arouse hatred and resentment. He is a remarkable man in that his whole life has been one of inconsistency and vacillation. He never remained true to any purpose, loyal to any friend, or steadfast to any conviction. He is wedded to no principle and bound by no conscience. He is a writer of the most cunning and dangerous species and a past master in fomenting trouble and aggravating delicate situations. As a creator of prejudice and a stirrer of strife he has no equal. He is a vindictive, self-anointed, intolerant political accident. He has been constant only in one thing, and that to attain high place in the councils of political leaders and to realize his life's ambition, political preferment. There is not a renowned statesman of this generation who has not been praised and abused, glorified and maligned, elevated and debased, eulogized and "cussed" at one time or another by George Harvey, the violence or mildness of his expressions being controlled by the exigencies of the moment and his temperamental condition. There never was such an unsuited and unfit individual in all the history of mankind by training, temperament, and environment to take up the

important duties as our representative at the Court of St. James as Col. Harvey.

I need not trespass upon the time of the Senate by refreshing your minds in reading the many malignant attacks of this man upon ex-President Wilson. They are known to you, and the suggestion only recalls to your minds the mendacious, unwarranted, inexcusable, and scurrilous assaults, by expressions and caricatures that he has constantly and persistently employed to destroy Woodrow Wilson, not only in the minds of the American people but throughout the world. His criticisms have been unrelenting, his pursuit of him through his journals and otherwise are only comparable to Milton's "hell hounds" that were stationed at the gates of the infernal regions. Not satisfied with becoming expression and judicious arguments to oppose the views of this man and his policies as President of the United States, he went further than the unfairest partisan would go and placed his fight almost on personal grounds. Not content in heaping personal abuse upon the President when in health, he pursued him with his scurrilous attacks to his sick bed and there misrepresented his ailment, trying to create in the public mind the impression that the President had lost his mind. Let me read from his own periodical and from his own pen expressions conceived in his own distorted imagination:

The issue of Harvey's Weekly of February 21, 1920, has a picture on the front page entitled "Lansing Gets His." Of course, he attacks, through this cartoon, Lansing the same as others, on whom he gives vent to his abnormal expressions. Lansing appears in the cartoon to be crying, his grip is up in the air, and his hat is falling to the ground. I may remind Senators, in passing, that that is the way Harvey got his some nine years ago.

He says in his leading article of this issue:

President Wilson has not gone crazy. Let the people who jumped to that conclusion when he discharged Secretary Lansing put any such notion out of mind. He has simply become normal. Again he is himself, his old self, his true self.

A little further on:

No; Mr. Wilson is not crazy. He is just mad; not as a hatter, but as a hornet that has been sat upon; so mad that he can't bear it without stinging.

I see before me certain reactionary gentlemen, some of whom sat in room three hundred and some odd at the Blackstone Hotel at the time of the Republican convention—the room that was rented by Col. George Harvey, and in which it was boasted afterwards that the late Republican candidate for President and the now President was nominated—wearing a broad smile upon their faces as I read from the mendacious pen of this man these scurrilous remarks, trying to give to the country the impression that the President had lost his mind.

He goes further. He does not stop there, Senators. I can not print in the RECORD these cartoons that I have here. I wish I could. You can refresh your memory by seeing them, if you desire. The people of the country will remember them. One of them portrayed him as a man of grief; but he was not satisfied with that disreputable conduct. He tried to draw the fire of indignation and condemnation upon the wife of the sick President.

I shall read some of those utterances, just to show you the kind of imagination of this man whom you voted to confirm as ambassador to the high Court of St. James. He says, in Harvey's Weekly of February 21, 1920:

True, there was nothing unusual in this, because we hear upon excellent authority practically all of Mr. Lansing's official correspondence during the past four months has been with "Mrs. Woodrow Wilson." Nevertheless, may we not—never mind, let it go—naturally surmise that the name Lansing served as the traditional red rag? Anyhow, the first letter was indited—olly, crafty, insinuating, and utterly false in all its implications; in a word, as we have remarked, wholly normal.

What he will do the good Lord may know, we don't, and we doubt if Mr. Wilson himself has the faintest suspicion. The doctors have disagreed or lied about his malady from the beginning. "Nervous exhaustion" was all Rear Doctor Grayson has ever admitted, to our knowledge, and the others have either contradicted one another or pooh-poohed every report. The only person who had it right almost from the start was Senator MOSES, who wrote to a constituent that he understood the ailment was a lesion of the brain, which had inflicted paralysis of the left side, including the arm and leg, and he was promptly jeered at by the doctors and sneered at by the President himself. And yet, if Dr. Hugh H. Young, of Johns Hopkins, can be believed, that was and is the real affliction.

From Harvey's Weekly of March 20, 1920, from this man's pen, I read:

There remains only Mrs. Wilson, and it is she whom our inquisitive contemporary, Collier's, finds upon investigation to be the country's "Executive by proxy." It is she who reads to him "such letters as she believes will interest her husband"; she who has been present invariably "whenever the President has admitted any member of his official family or any other visitor"; she "with whose assistance he reviews much of the official business before him and signs documents"; she to whom he "outlines letters and memoranda which she later writes and dispatches to Cabinet officers and others," with the result that

"numerous department heads to-day display with pride letters which clearly and concisely outline the President's position on various questions—letters signed Edith Bolling Wilson"; she who "takes from her husband's shoulders problems in tactful letter writing" bearing upon "proposed and effected Cabinet changes"; she who is "called upon to digest long pardon pleas, with their puzzling legal technicalities, department reports," etc.; she whose discussion "touches everything from current topics to friends and foes"; she through whom those in the know "seek assistance for personal or political favors from the President"; she, in a word, who "has not only proved herself a real mistress of the White House, but mistress of a situation unique in American political life."

That the difficult tasks thus imposed upon or assumed by Mrs. Wilson as "Executive by proxy" are performed most intelligently and with full appreciation of the tremendous responsibility involved, we are assured both by Collier's and others in a position to know.

Whether, however—

Says the new ambassador to Great Britain—

the natural inclination of a loving wife to shield an invalid husband from vexation of spirit which might tend to aggravate his malady can be so fully restrained as to permit the presentation of differing and antagonizing views essential to clear understanding of a situation is perhaps a question.

It is inconceivable that a direct descendant of Pocahontas, and consequently the purest American in the administration, and, with the possible exception of Senators CURRIS and OWEN, who also are part Indian, in public life, would not welcome the protection afforded her native land by the Senate's reservations.

And, sirs, why, I am asked, was this policy pursued against Woodrow Wilson and all that was dear to him? Was it on the high elevation and broad grounds of statesmanship? Was it because of an honest difference of opinion? Was it because of a conviction against the theories and policies of Woodrow Wilson? Was it because he had no faith in his character, ability, and statesmanship? No, Mr. President; I wish that I might believe that were true; I wish that this Senate and the country could believe that the brilliancy of this man's style, the persistency of his efforts, the constancy of his writings against the policies of Woodrow Wilson could be placed upon that ground.

But, sirs, reluctant as I am to conclude, it is to the shame and dishonor of his name that the views of Col. Harvey toward Woodrow Wilson were born of disappointment, nurtured in envy, and kept alive through bitterest hate.

Why, sirs, what was the opinion of Col. Harvey toward Woodrow Wilson in 1912 and in the years preceding? I prefer to accept his estimate of him at that period, when his mind had not become distorted by hatred and his heart hardened through disappointment.

Sirs, it was he who was one of the first to discern the latent powers of greatness in Woodrow Wilson. It was he who was one of the first to reveal to the country the matchless qualities of his great intellect and statesmanship. It was he who was one of the first to point out to the people of America the high ideals and wonderful vision of Woodrow Wilson. It was he who was the first at the Lotos Club, in the city of New York, on the 3d day of February, 1906, who suggested him as the strongest Democrat for the Democratic nomination for President and the best-equipped American for the Chief Executive of the Nation. Let me read to the Senate a part of the speech that was made by Col. Harvey at that time.

I read from Col. George Harvey's book entitled "The Power of Tolerance." In speaking to this club on Woodrow Wilson 15 years ago he said:

When last summer a Princeton man, a famous Princeton man—

Says George Harvey—

and as honest a man as ever achieved commercial success, was harassed into resigning his well-earned position as the president of a great insurance company, there was another ready and fully equipped to assume the chief responsibility.

For nearly a century before Woodrow Wilson was born the atmosphere of the Old Dominion was surcharged with true statesmanship. The fates directed his steps along other paths, but the effect of growth among the traditions of the fathers remained.

Says George Harvey:

That he is preeminent as a lucid interpreter of history we all know. But he is more than that. No one who reads understandingly the record of his country that flowed with such apparent ease from his pen can fail to be impressed by the belief that he is by instinct a statesman. The grasp of fundamentals, the seemingly unconscious application of primary truths to changing conditions, the breadth in thought and reason manifested on those pages, are as clear evidences of sagacity worthy of the best and noblest of Virginia's traditions as was that truly eloquent appeal which last year he addressed to his brethren of the South that they rise manfully from the ashes of prejudice and lethargy and come back into their own.

It is that type of men—

Says George Harvey—

we shall, if, indeed, we do not already, need in our public life. No one would think for a moment of criticizing the general reformation of the human race in all of its multifarious phases now going on by Executive decree, but it is becoming increasingly evident that that great work will soon be accomplished to the complete satisfaction, of course, of all concerned. When that time shall have been reached the country

will need at least a short breathing spell for what the physicians term perfect rest. That day, not now far distant, will call for a man combining the activities of the present with the sobering influences of the past.

If one could be found who, in addition to those qualities, should unite in his personality the finest instinct of true statesmanship as the effect of his early environment and the no less valuable capacity for practical application achieved through subsequent endeavors in another field, the ideal would be attained. Such a man, I believe, is Woodrow Wilson, of Virginia and New Jersey.

Says George Harvey:

As one of a considerable number of Democrats who have grown tired of voting Republican tickets, it is with a feeling almost of rapture that I occasionally contemplate even a remote possibility of casting a ballot for the president of Princeton University to become President of the United States.

In any case, since opportunities in national conventions are rare and usually preempted, to the enlightened and enlightening Lotos Club I make the nomination.

But that is not all. I read further from Col. Harvey's book on Tolerance. He pays a more glowing tribute to this man against whom he has now turned. He was speaking in Savannah, Ga., to the Hibernian Society, on March 17, 1911, and this was his estimate of Wilson at that time. This was, sirs, before he was disappointed by being refused political preference:

But I hear you say responsibilities should be divided. True. Let the apportionment be even. The West, through the present leader of our party, has supplied us as well as the opposition with the majority, though not the greatest, of our issues. The South, through you, your statesmen, and your journalists, is to harmonize and amalgamate the party, if necessary, by force. What less in common fairness can the East do than produce the man? Gentlemen, we have him, and he is yours. He is Woodrow Wilson, the highly Americanized Scotch-Irishman, descended from Ohio, born in Virginia, developed in Maryland, married in Georgia, and now delivering from bondage that faithful old Democratic Commonwealth, the State of New Jersey.

Great occasions find great men. Here is one who, if he had lived in the days of Jefferson and Madison, would have rivaled the one as a champion of the people and would have equaled the other in comprehension and lucid expression of fundamental law. No other living personality so happily combines the dominant traits of those two great statesmen; no other has evidenced so perfect a blending of profound knowledge and simple devotion to humanity; no other has shown so clearly how quickly the old truths spring into new light and power when touched by the magic wand of full sincerity.

Beautiful words!

No other more surely embodies the authority of sustained thought, of unrelenting labor for unselfish ends, the spirit of sacrifice and devotion, the instinct of independence, the love of perfect freedom.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I am quoting from Col. George Harvey, the gentleman whom the Senator from Illinois only last Saturday voted to confirm as the ambassador to the high Court of St. James.

Mr. McCORMICK. May I ask the Senator the date of the address?

Mr. HARRISON. This was in 1912.

Mr. McCORMICK. That was before the colonel came to the conclusion in which 6,999,999 other Americans joined.

Mr. HARRISON. This was before Col. Harvey was disappointed by not obtaining an ambassadorship from Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States.

Now, I read further:

Born a polemic and controversialist, intellectually combative and self-reliant, fearless to the verge of temerity, indifferent to applause or censure for its own sake, incapable of intrigue, prompt to accept conclusions based upon right versus wrong without inquiring or caring whether they be politic or even expedient, persuasive in oratory, but devoid of artifice, too intent, too earnest to employ cheap and paltry devices, his pockets filled with moral dynamite, his every thought springing from knowledge that all of the basic principles in our political order, including conservatism, emerged from the well of the most radical democracy, and that democracy itself is only letting in light and air, at the height of his powers of intellect and judgment, upon the high plateau of middle life, best adapted to noble and enduring achievement, stands the man, the liberal, the progressive, the radical, if you will, wide-eyed, open-minded, calm, resolute, exact in thought, effective in action, the most vivid and virile personality, save one, developed on American soil in half a century. Such gentlemen, without exaggeration or undue emphasis, is Woodrow Wilson.

The old South has bred great statesmen from the beginning of the Republic. To her greatest, the peerless son of Virginia, we owe the political emancipation of the people from oligarchical rule and the establishment of the political party which has survived the assaults of a century. Now let the new South give to the new Democracy another true leader, armed with the power of his faith in the people and their faith in him, and the quickened spirit which enabled Jefferson to break the bonds of paternalism will again become the glory of the Nation.

But, splendid as was that encomium, great as were those expressions touching this man against whom he afterwards turned, they do not compare with the expressions of greatness touching him which appeared throughout his writings along during that time.

It is not to be wondered, Mr. President, that this man who once held Woodrow Wilson in such high esteem and paid such glowing tributes to his character and statesmanship should, during the last few years, have employed his unrivaled genius in

caustic criticism of him. The reason is simple. The cause is apparent. Col. Harvey knows it. You know it. And the country knows it. You will recall how every newspaper in America, in glowing headlines, carried the news in the early part of 1912, just when the memorable campaign was beginning to wax warm for Democratic and Republican nominations for President, that Woodrow Wilson had repudiated George Harvey and requested him to cease his activity for him. You will recall how Woodrow Wilson took the American people into his confidence and told them that the support of George Harvey was not desired, that he was simply an errand boy for Wall Street and the tool of the special interests of the country.

Let me read to you what George Harvey himself said on this proposition. I read from Harper's Weekly of January 20, 1912, which he then controlled and edited. Here is what he said:

We make the following reply to many inquiries from readers of Harper's Weekly:

The name of Woodrow Wilson as our candidate for President was taken down from the head of these columns in response to a statement made to us directly by Gov. Wilson, to the effect that our support was affecting his candidacy injuriously.

The only course left open to us, in simple fairness to Mr. Wilson no less than in the consideration of our own self-respect, was to cease to advocate his nomination.

We make this explanation with great reluctance and the deepest regret. But we can not escape the conclusion that the very considerable number of our readers, who have cooperated earnestly and loyally in advancing a movement which was inaugurated solely in the hope of rendering a high public service, are clearly entitled to this information.

So spoke the gentleman whom you have honored as the new ambassador to the high Court of St. James.

Can anyone doubt the reasons for the opposition of George Harvey to Woodrow Wilson? Can there be any question of the motive that prompted him since that day in his scurrilous and persistent opposition to Woodrow Wilson and his policies?

And, Mr. President, because of this change of front, because of the constant unwarranted misrepresentation and inexcusable attacks upon the part of George Harvey against Woodrow Wilson and his policies, the American people will not be shaken in the belief that his nomination as ambassador to the Court of St. James by the present President of the United States is the reward for his efforts.

And, sirs, may I venture the suggestion, while I have no disposition to criticize the present President of the United States in the manner of his appointments or in the motives that underlie these appointments, I do not believe that there is any act exercised up to date by Warren Harding that is less popular and has aroused more resentment in this country than the nomination of the subject of this discussion. The American people believe in gratitude. They do not offer criticism of those in authority who appoint friends to offices, provided they are capable and qualified for the position, but the American people will not stand for the appointment of inefficient, incompetent, and unsuited men to high places simply in order to compensate them for waging an unwarranted warfare upon the character and policies of another man.

If this nomination did not come to the Senate for confirmation because of the services that George Harvey had rendered in his scurrilous and unjust and unwavering attacks upon Woodrow Wilson, then on what is it based? Is it because of fealty to the Republican Party? Is it because of any great service that he has in the years gone by rendered to the leaders of that great party? No, Mr. President, not that.

It did not come because of fealty to the Republican Party, nor for services to its leaders, because the same unfair and mendacious attacks have been employed by his pen against that party and its leaders as against Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic Party. That you may see the vacillating attitude of this man touching men and measures, let me read what he said in his periodical, Harper's Weekly, on the 21st day of February, 1920, about Theodore Roosevelt:

Proposals for Roosevelt memorials are being made in various States, and official commissions are being appointed to plan and execute such works. There is little danger of thus paying too much attention and respect to the memory of one of the foremost Americans of our age, and every tasteful and appropriate project to that end is to be encouraged. But the memorial of him that would be most in keeping with his own desires will be the popular cherishing and triumphant development of the spirit of true Americanism, of which he was the finest and most aggressive exponent in his day and generation.

Great is his praise of President Roosevelt at this time. It was not because of any fixed opinion that he possessed on the subject, it was not because of an honest conviction that he held touching President Roosevelt, but it was because, due to disappointment in not being appointed to a high ambassadorial position by Woodrow Wilson and by not being taken into the fold of Democratic leadership, he was trying to obtain entrée

into the good graces of the Republican Party, and he felt that this was the best and safest avenue of approach.

But, sirs, Harvey's true estimate of Theodore Roosevelt was expressed in 1912 and in the years preceding. It was then that he gave vent to his unbiased views. It was then that he expressed himself in the same unrelenting and caustic manner that he employed in future years against Woodrow Wilson. Let me read some of the passages from the pen of this man respecting the character and standing of Theodore Roosevelt.

In Harper's Weekly of January 27, 1912, he said:

Roosevelt stands for perpetuation of barbaric methods. * * * Mr. Roosevelt would have the law fit the case, invariably to his own political advantage. * * * He has been notably successful, truly; but only when in power. Given all the weapons of authority and utter lack of scruple in using them he has proven himself invincible. Witness his forcing of money out of corporations, his terrifying of individuals, his robbery of Panama. But as a fighter from outside the breastworks he has won little renown. * * * If Mr. Roosevelt were in the White House to-day he would be irrepressible. He will be if he ever gets there again. * * * If Roosevelt, by chicanery or chance, should steal the nomination from the man who is entitled to it by party precedent and well-intentioned service, 2,000,000 Republicans would voice their resentment at the polls.

In Harper's Weekly of February 3, 1912, he said:

If any chapter in American history is more discreditable than the one which Dr. Leander T. Chamberlain has told in his North American Review article on ex-President Roosevelt and the Panama imbroglio of 1903, we hope that Dr. Chamberlain himself will record it without loss of time. We recall no chronicle since the interview of Nathan with David that has left less to be said.

In proclaiming that every action taken in that adventure was not only proper, but also "was carried out in accordance with the highest, finest, and nicest standards of public and governmental ethics," he tempted Providence and historical criticism beyond the line of overstrain. The fine propriety of warning an independent Republic with which you have a treaty of friendship and cooperation that she must ratify a new convention or prepare to experience regret, the moral attitude of a mandate forbidding a sovereign Government to put down insurrection in one of its own Provinces, and the punctilious delicacy of entering "into relations" with a new Republic one day and three-quarters after she had blushing announced herself—these are elements in his ethical performance which the gentleman who "took" the real estate desired, and consecrated it to "collective civilization," asks us to admire.

Dr. Chamberlain has used descriptive and characterizing phrases which will appeal strongly to Mr. Roosevelt's feeling for style, but the "deep damnation" which the record accords lies not in the language employed; it inheres, unhappily, in the documentary sources.

In Harper's Weekly of March 2, 1912, he said:

Hate is at the bottom of Roosevelt's candidacy. He knows he can not get the Republican nomination. He knows he would be beaten out of his boots if he did. Consequently he doesn't want it. His one purpose in life at this time is to beat Taft.

Meanwhile he will continue to pose as the only real "champeen of the people," and will never miss a chance to stab Taft. If necessary to misrepresent his views and lie about him—

says Col. George Harvey in speaking of the idol of the Republican Party—

he will do that, as he did in Columbus, when he stamped the President as one of "those eminent lawyers who more or less frankly disbelieve in our entire system of American Government," who "believe and sometimes assert that the American people are not fitted for popular government."

In the same issue he said:

If the ticket should be Roosevelt and LA FOLLETTE, what a gorgeous campaign cry could be made of Theodore and Pompadour!

On April 6, 1912, he said in the same paper:

If last week the Republicans had renominated Mr. Taft upon a platform unsatisfactory to the "rump candidate" and his following, and the Democrats were to assemble in convention next week, the nomination of Speaker Clark would be a virtual certainty, for the reasons succinctly set forth by our sagacious friend.

Speaking of Theodore Roosevelt—

Naught now remains for the cry baby and his satellites but to demand the acceptance of some of his notions as party principles.

Cry babies, too, those gallant Progressives throughout the country who followed the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt, who are reviled by this man whom you have honored as ambassador to Great Britain, as "cry babies," as "rump followers."

Further, he said in Harper's Weekly of April 20, 1912, in speaking of Roosevelt carrying Illinois in the campaign for delegates to the Republican convention:

When the time came to seek delegates from Illinois, however, Mr. Roosevelt not only utterly ignored the facts relating to President Taft's attitude, but deliberately misrepresented it to the people of Illinois. The inevitable consequence was that Mr. Taft was forced to bear the burden thus falsely and maliciously placed upon his shoulders.

Of all the base acts of which Mr. Roosevelt has been guilty, in his frantic endeavors to discredit his former friend, this probably is the basest. What further he can do to satisfy his wicked vindictiveness must needs depend upon the extent of his desperation.

And in the same issue, at its masthead, he has a call to arms in which in big letters he says, in speaking of Roosevelt:

Down with the demagogue! Save the Republic.

It was an insult to the intelligence of the American people who believed in the high ideals of Theodore Roosevelt to have

paid this man at this time the tribute that you have, in view of these utterances of George Harvey in 1912 against Theodore Roosevelt.

And, sirs, he did not stop at that. Not only did he employ his pen to prejudice the popular mind against Roosevelt and arouse the prejudice of the people against him at that time, but in every issue of the periodical that he controlled, and the policies of which he dominated, there Roosevelt was cartooned and caricatured as mercilessly and unfairly almost as Wilson was later.

I wish you would look at some of the cartoons that I have here of Taft and of Roosevelt, showing the way this man has misrepresented them to the American people, and tried to create a false impression touching them in the country. They are here.

I shall not take up the time of the Senate in reading excerpts from his Weekly during the last two years against William Howard Taft. Here are a few of the cartoons carried in it, making light of this man who is respected the country over and who has been honored by high place in the Republican Party. The excerpts that I might read to you from the writings of George Harvey touching William Howard Taft during the past two years—full of scurrilous import and unwarranted, unfair misrepresentations—are so unlike the tribute and encomiums that were written touching Taft 10 years ago.

You know what he said about him. You know how he criticized his views on the League of Nations. You know what he said about the association of Taft and Wilson in trying to promote that great scheme for humanity. There are cartoons here galore that put Taft, the great leader of your party, in a false light, cartoons wrought by a cartoonist under the direction of George Harvey, whom you have placed at the high Court of St. James as your ambassador.

But these leaders of American thought are not the only ones who have fallen under the knife of this journalistic surgeon. These cartoons and excerpts which I shall not read, because I do not want to trespass too much upon the time of the Senate, are evidence of the same wordy warfare, the same intolerant disposition and unyielding attack made on Herbert Hoover. I hold no brief to defend him against the assaults of the new ambassador to Great Britain, who has just been honored by the party in which Herbert Hoover now plays a very commanding part. I merely cite it to show the traits of his character, the manner of his expression, and the unusual eccentricities of the man.

Herbert Hoover is cartooned, misrepresented, maligned, and criticized. He who has been honored by the present President by appointment as Secretary of Commerce, who sits at the council table and advises what the policies of the Republican Party should be—Herbert Hoover, who has friends in the country by the hundreds of thousands, maligned and defiled by George Harvey, the new ambassador to the Court of St. James.

Let me read from his writings what he says about one of the leaders on the other side of the aisle, a Senator of long service and of great influence in the councils of his party. Let me see if I can find that. That is quite interesting, but I have so much good stuff here.

In speaking of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in Harper's Weekly, February 10, he said—and I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin voted for his confirmation or not:

In our desire to be wholly fair to the gentleman most concerned, we feel constrained to say that we do not believe Mr. LA FOLLETTE is merely a mask for Mr. Roosevelt. The great untried would never stand for a mask with its hair standing on end.

Then from Harper's Weekly of February 10 I read in speaking of the same Senator—I am reading from his editorial on LA FOLLETTE.

Dear, dear!

Said George Harvey—

What a trial it must be to be a frantic candidate! We have never regarded LA FOLLETTE as even a possibility. A hopelessly one-sided egotist, without balance or bottom, hacking about from pillar to post, merely scratching the surface of things, and, of late, scolding, scolding, to no purpose and with no perceivable purpose except to reach the White House.

I shall not continue reading this infamous article written against one of the distinguished Senators here by the new ambassador to the Court of St. James. He talks about him and employs language more emphatic, more scurrilous than he has ever employed about anyone else among the leaders of the Republican Party.

Mr. President, these citations to which I have called the attention of the Senate, these cartoons and expressions, reveal stronger than any words I might employ the unfitness of this

man for high diplomatic place. They portray his intolerant disposition and temperamental unfitness. But, conclusive as they are to show the manner of man that he is, unwise, biased, and unfair as were his attacks upon Woodrow Wilson and other statesmen while in the full vigor of life, unjustifiable as they were on the ex-President while lying prostrate on the bed of sickness—his life hanging as it were by a delicate thread—inexcusable as they were in bringing Mrs. Wilson's name into the controversy, they do not compare to his action when obsessed with such opposition to the League of Nations that his personal journal entered the sacred precincts of religion and blasphemed the holy name of the blessed Virgin Mary, scoffing at the religious convictions of people, and holding up the Immaculate Conception to jest and mockery.

This cartoon which I have here, and which Senators have seen and the country has seen in Harvey's Weekly of October 23, is one of the blackest pages of the last campaign.

This one act as portrayed in this cartoon that I hold in my hand as carried in his periodical on October 23, 1920, was the crowning feat of his journalistic infamy.

I know that there was not a reputable Christian man or woman who allied themselves in the fight against the League of Nations and the Democratic Party in the recent campaign who did not bow their heads in shame and condemned in their hearts such an unspeakable method to win votes.

I know that you Senators on that side of the aisle realized when you saw it carried as a Republican campaign cartoon that you felt it an outrage and insult to the intelligence of the American people and an assault upon religious convictions.

There you are. I have exhibited it to you. You can see it and refresh your memory. You saw it in the campaign, because periodical after periodical and newspaper after newspaper throughout the country condemned this and the man who got it out.

There you are, Senators; the vilest, most dastardly, and sacrilegious cartoon ever conceived and published in America.

When the mind of a journalist has become so deranged and distorted, when the heart of a cartoonist has become so devoid of reverence for the spirit of the Virgin Mary, when hate has become a disease and has driven from the mind of man the finer qualities embodied in Christianity, then that person has no right to represent a Christian, tolerant, and just people in any position of trust in the world. But some one may say that Mr. Harvey afterwards apologized for this cartoon. Yes; he did. He was forced to do so. And at that it was more of a disclaimer than an apology.

I read from Harvey's Weekly of November 6, 1920, where he says, "I will not disclaim responsibility for the appearance in my paper; I am simply telling how it happened," and he tells how it happened.

Yes; he disclaimed when he was forced to do it. On November 6, four days after the election, was the first expression that this man gave to the country touching this scurrilous cartoon.

Mr. President and Senators, let me impress upon you the fact that Harvey's Weekly was the mouthpiece of the opposition to Woodrow Wilson and the League of Nations in the late campaign. Week by week appeared cartoons on the League of Nations that carried out the idea that he conceived and which he believed advanced the cause of the opposition. Every editorial of a political nature during this time was written by him. The circulation of it increased by the thousands. It was thought and understood to be the greatest exponent of the opposition to the League of Nations and Wilson of any weekly or periodical in the country. It is inconceivable to imagine when that campaign had reached the height of interest, the very peak of bitterness, the point of strongest antagonism and contention, that the editor did not plan every article that went into it, formulate every policy of it, and approve every cartoon that went into it. Why, it was no secret that during the three months immediately preceding that election George Harvey was a frequent visitor to Marion and a guest in the home of the Republican nominee. It was known to all men that no one in America was in closer touch with the Republican nominee and on the inside of what was going on in those stirring days when the campaign was at fever heat than George Harvey.

Why, it was no secret, and you Senators on the other side know that it was published in all the papers at the time—during the three months immediately preceding his election.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Is that an additional reason against the nomination of Mr. Harvey by the President, whose guest he was and whose supporter he was?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, I suppose that he did have the biggest hand in "putting the President over," as I called to the atten-

tion of the Senate a few moments ago. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois was present that night in the room at the Blackstone Hotel, which was paid for by George Harvey, when it was planned that the present President was to be "put over" the next day on a certain ballot.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Illinois pleads guilty to the soft impeachment.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Illinois pleads guilty. I thought he would, for he is one of the real leaders of the Republican Party, and I feel sure that the ordeal could not have been accomplished, that the nomination could not have been made, even though the influence of Col. Harvey was great, without the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois being present and taking part in the arrangements.

Mr. President, it was common rumor that many of the phrases employed by the Republican nominee in his speeches in that campaign were the product of the peculiarities of this man's mind. Notwithstanding these facts, George Harvey never entered a disclaimer at any time of responsibility for the appearance of the cartoon in his periodical on October 23 and offered no apology until four days after the election.

Let me cite to the Senate and the country another remarkable fact connected with the incident of this cartoon. Will Hays, as chairman of the Republican national committee, issued a statement expressing regret for its appearance. The Republican nominee, Mr. Harding, on the 29th day of October, in a statement to the press disclaimed responsibility and condemned it.

Neither of these statements, I might say in passing, were issued by either of these gentlemen until the sacrilegious cartoon had been read by hundreds of thousands of people and condemned by Christians everywhere. When the managers of the Republican Party, both Mr. Hays, its chairman, and Mr. Harding, its presidential nominee, saw the fires of indignation sweeping over the country because of its mendacious import—I will not say they were forced—mildly speaking, they were influenced because of the fear of condemnation by the people at the polls, to issue the statements. But, mind you, Senators, not one word of apology from George Harvey was heard touching that cartoon from the date of its appearance in Harvey's periodical on October 23, up to and including the day of the election, November 2.

Rumors had it that Republican leadership had importuned George Harvey to disclaim it and offer an apology; but they told us that he was obdurate and tenaciously clung to the idea that, so far as he was concerned, he would allow the cartoon to speak for itself and results take care of themselves. He knew how he felt toward the League of Nations. He felt that it was a damnable proposition, and, to arouse the people of the country against it, he was willing, without protestation on his part, for the mouthpiece of the Republican Party, as edited by him, to carry a cartoon of such nature as to make a mockery of Christianity and a sacrilege of the mother of Jesus.

It was impossible, sirs, for him not to have known that it was appearing in Harvey's Weekly on October 23, or in the days that followed up to the day of election that it had appeared in his periodical. You will note from the statement issued by the Republican nominee, President Harding, that he says, and this statement was issued on October 29:

My attention has been called to the cartoon published in Harvey's Weekly portraying the Democratic nominee in a difficult task of hanging a portrait of Uncle Sam, but I did not only disapprove of this cartoon but weeks ago I came in possession of an advance copy in my capacity as a publisher and immediately asked our boys at Marion—

Referring to his newspaper office—to wire and ask its suppression.

As will be seen from that statement, weeks before October 29 the cartoon had been called to the President's attention, and he had condemned it and had asked the "boys in his office" to suppress it and not to use it. If weeks before it had appeared in Harvey's Weekly it was known to the Republican nominee that this cartoon was being sent out, then certainly the Republican nominee had thought it sufficiently outrageous to talk the matter over with the man who controlled the policies of the paper in which it was to appear. There was no reason why he should not. They all were at Marion or in Republican headquarters conferring over political matters and campaign policies. I do not know of whom the President requested the suppression of the cartoon.

His statement says he requested the boys in the office; but whether the boys were to ask the headquarters to suppress it is not revealed by this statement. If the President made the request of the owner of Harvey's Weekly, in which paper it first appeared as a campaign document, and George Harvey refused to accept the suggestion of the Republican nominee, then it makes the offense more reprehensible. If this was a

campaign document issued by the Republican management, and the President requested, as he said he did, in his statement on October 29, "its suppression" three weeks before, and his managers continued to send it out and have it appear as a campaign document, then their conduct, too, is reprehensible. I care not which horn of the dilemma this situation may fall upon, it is a remarkable fact connected with this incident that Albert T. Reid, the cartoonist who wrought the design, was the duly appointed, regularly constituted cartoonist of the Republican Party.

Mr. Reid was in that campaign and is now in the employ of the Republican management doing cartoon work. Why, sirs, I care not how much Mr. Harvey may disclaim, how much he may apologize for this infamous assault on the religion of thousands of Christians in this country, they will never forget it and the appointment of this man as ambassador to the high court of St. James is an insult to their intelligence and an assault upon their religion.

In a lecture on "Journalism and the university" at Yale University on March 12, 1908, George Harvey delivered a very interesting address. In that address he expressed in very glowing language, most beautiful phrases and pleasing style, his estimate of certain great journalists of this country. In that discussion he pointed out the strong qualities as well as the weakness of these men, and told what, in his opinion, was the line of duty that journalists should follow, and the qualities of greatness in various journalists. I wish to read briefly what he says about some of the great men of that profession. I read from this remarkable book, entitled "The Power of Tolerance," edited by George Harvey. In the lecture referred to he says:

The master journalist must have stability of purpose and coolness of judgment.

As I read from this remarkable address I would have Senators follow his language and his estimate of men to see how little he corresponds to the measurement of greatness which he applies to men of the journalistic profession. He continues:

Greeley had neither. Impulsive, erratic, heedless in thought, violent in expression, eager to lead, no matter whither, impatient of restraint of any kind, the mighty influence acquired by his undoubted genius, reinforced by public faith in the purity of his intentions and the worship even of his obvious faults by the multitude of his followers, was wielded for ill almost as frequently as for good, and more than once seriously imperiled the very existence of the Nation which he loved with the fervor of a votary.

The master journalist must have perspective as well as perception; his is a jealous calling, demanding the exercise of every mental and moral fibril, and exacting above all that consistency which is inseparable from conviction.

Whoever paid the compliment to George Harvey that he was consistent in any purpose or in his affection or respect for any man?

Keen and brilliant as he was, Raymond could make no discrimination between essentials and nonessentials when opportunity for contention offered. Peddler or archbishop could draw his fire by the merest allusion; no threat of controversy was too absurd, no source thereof too insignificant to distract his attention from public affairs and absorb his entire interest. Yet more serious was his subordination of a great journal to the petty purposes of a political party, in the machinery of which he most prided himself upon being one of a hundred cogs; hence his variability of policy which became a byword and sapped his authority.

He goes further and says:

The master journalist must have conscience, character, conviction—

Whoever complimented him by saying he had convictions about anything—vacillating in his course, praising to-day a man whom he had maligned yesterday, and advocating things to-day that he had denounced the previous day—

his aim must be to uplift humanity, not to profit by its degradation. Bennett had personal integrity; he never sold an opinion—

Says George Harvey of this great journalist. When he delivered that lecture and when he uttered those words it was a virtue that this great journalist, Bennett, had never sold an opinion. He thought that one of the greatest of virtues; and yet the facts revealed, which fasten themselves around George Harvey, show that he constantly employed his talents for political purposes—in other words, bartered his opinions—

he never cheated or lied or bowed before mammon; and he was the most energetic and successful gatherer of news the world has produced.

The master journalist—

Says George Harvey—

must cherish no personal animosities.

Oh, he could see the virtues in other men; he could discriminate between the good and the bad qualities; and in this remarkable lecture, as revealed in this book, entitled "The Power of Tolerance," before that great audience, he said, "The master journalist must cherish no personal animosities."

Though relentless in pursuit of wrongdoers, he must be just and forbearing when vindictiveness could only inflict pain upon the innocent and serve no useful purpose. Dana was the prince of his craft, the

skilled workman, the artist, the developer of style, the first, and, so far the last, hand at the loom from which spins the finished product. To the intensity of his nature must we attribute the unforgiving spirit which marred a professional career otherwise unmatched in proficiency. The master journalist is suggestive, constructive. Godkin's talent was great and facile, but his instrument was the rapier; his hand never knew the trowel.

And, in this same lecture, he says:

Herein we find a lesson. If it be true that Bowles outranked his gifted contemporaries, retaining to the end a truer perspective and sounder judgment, his preeminence obviously can not be attributed to either mental or moral superiority; it must have sprung necessarily from another underlying cause. Such, in truth, is the fact. Bowles was free. Almost all of the others at some stage in their careers wore the shackles of personal political ambition.

And that is one of the vices in his estimate of this man at that time; and now, to a more remarkable degree than ever man possessed before, he holds now a virtue that at that time he condemned in that man.

Greeley was a fitful aspirant to public office from the day his journal became a power, and he died, finally, broken-hearted by his inability to attain the Presidency, for which hardly a man then living was less fitted.

Yes; and this man Harvey probably would have died broken-hearted, too, from the ambition to hold political office, if he had not, perchance, had a room in the Blackstone Hotel at the time of the Republican convention, and invited there distinguished Republican leaders, including the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], and fixed upon this program that ushered the present President into the White House.

He further says:

Raymond, after years of active participation in practical politics, perceived the folly of his course and forsook further entanglements, only, however, to discover that the habit had become irresistible, and at the time of his death he was chairman of a State committee. Dana's life was embittered and his judgment clouded by the refusal of a President and a governor to recognize his personal claims. Even the incorrigible Bennett was hushed by the offer of a diplomatic mission.

He held that a vice to the student body of that great university, and condemned a great journalist, employing this strong yet succinct language:

Even the incorrigible Bennett was hushed by the offer of a diplomatic mission.

And now the faults that he points out in Bennett he possesses in this remarkable degree himself.

From the day when the first note of independence was sounded to the very present, the bane of journalism has been the political ambitions of the journalists themselves. Politicians have profited steadily and increasingly, and the public has suffered correspondingly, from this insatiable craving for public position. Nor have our foremost statesmen hesitated to avail themselves of the opportunities thus presented. President Lincoln may have been warranted in considering that the end justified the means when he offered to Bennett the ministry to France, but his act served only to silence criticism of Johnson when that President tendered the Austrian ministry to Raymond in return for support which could not otherwise have been obtained.

Oh, yes; George Harvey knew when he accepted a post of honor, such as the ambassadorship to the Court of St. James, that the people of America would criticize it; and yet he cares so little about the proposition, he is so well following the consistency of his course touching gratitude, that he did not care how it might affect the present President of the United States. He wanted this position, he went in for it, and he got it. He forgot all about the virtues about which he had waxed enthusiastic and spoken eloquently.

To this day—

Says George Harvey—

not only has the custom been maintained, but, judging from the fact that never before have so many editors and writers held appointive political positions as at present, it seems by no means to be waning.

The fitness or unfitness of those selected is not a point in issue. It is the practice only which we deprecate. And, call it what we may—a bribe to insure a continuance of allegiance or, less obnoxiously, a reward for services rendered—the outcome of every one of such transactions is the same—the people's loss of a champion and a newspaper's sacrifice of its birthright for a glittering bauble.

Those are the words of the new ambassador to the high Court of St. James.

What, then—

Says he—

shall we conclude? That an editor shall bar acceptance of public position under any circumstances? Yes; absolutely; and any thought or hope of such preferment else his avowed purpose is not his true one; his policy is one of deceit in pursuance of an unannounced end.

Could stronger language be employed to show Harvey up in his true light than the language he himself employed in condemning journalists who turn over the pages of their newspapers or journals in order to obtain political preferment?

His guidance is untrustworthy, his calling that of a teacher false to his disciples for personal advantage, his conduct a gross betrayal not only of public confidence, but also of the faith of every true journalist jealous of a profession which should be of the noblest and the farthest removed from base uses in the interest of selfish men.

There is but one conceivable conclusion in logic or in morals, namely, that true journalism and the politics that seek personal advancement

are not and can not be made cooperative; from the radical difference in their very natures and the impossibility of reconciling what should be the idealism of the one with the practicalism of the other, they must be essentially antagonistic.

Mr. President, these facts which I have laid before the Senate are sufficient in themselves to show that this nomination should not have been made by the President nor confirmed by the Senate, but I shall not rest the case upon those facts alone—glaring and sufficient as they are. There are other and graver reasons why George Harvey should not at this time go as our ambassador to the Court of St. James.

Few periods, if any, in the history of America approach the present in the stupendous and difficult and delicate problems with which our country is now confronted. In the solution of the many complex and intricate economic questions affecting our domestic affairs the wisest of our statesmen should be employed. Those problems, many as they are, are related to and interwoven with the complex international affairs of the world. Certainly there was never a period in the world's history when established institutions were more threatened, international affairs more deranged, and our foreign relations more delicate. To meet these problems not only at home but abroad our constituted authorities must be not only statesmen of ability but endowed with a spirit of tolerance, tact, and forbearance that will make their efforts count in the adjustment that is needed and must come.

There is not a foreign power to-day with which we must not build anew an amicable understanding. There is not an important foreign power with which differences have not arisen that must be settled. Some of these problems are greater and more numerous with one foreign country than another. They are all interwoven, and the solution of problems with any one will affect the settlement of the problems of the world. This is due to the fact that many of our treaties have been abrogated, many of our promises have not been kept, and many of our pledges have been broken. The problems connected with the World War, the settlements effected at Versailles, and the action of the United States Senate and American authorities have created in certain countries distrust instead of confidence, suspicion instead of faith, despair instead of hope.

The representative of this Government at the Court of St. James at this time will have a hard and difficult task. It will devolve upon him more than upon any other authority to revive faith in us and restore our formerly commanding and happy position. The representative of this Government, therefore, not only to the Court of St. James but to France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, and other countries should be characters against whom no finger of suspicion can point and no feeling of distrust can be manifested. They should be men trained in the arts of diplomacy, endowed with ability, tact, poise, temperament, and discretion, so that they can win for themselves commanding influence and gain anew for the American people its dominant place in the diplomatic affairs of the world.

It would seem to me and I am sure to you, sirs, not only an unwise but a very indiscreet thing to send as our ambassador to Italy a man who had criticized constantly its leaders and opposed consistently and injudiciously its policies. It would be equally as unwise and an act of indiscretion for this country to send as its representative to France one who had spoken intemperately of that country, criticized its policies, and abused its leaders. It would be equally as unwise and certainly as indiscreet to send as our ambassador to the high Court of St. James a man who had made himself obnoxious through his utterances or writings to the leaders of English thought in opposing their policies and criticizing its leaders.

The subject of this discussion has made himself offensive or he will become offensive to the people of Great Britain as soon as they have been informed of his constant opposition and his injudicious expressions touching some of its policies and the character of its leaders. Some of you may think that he won popular favor in Great Britain through the strong terms that he employed in his writings against certain elements of the Irish people. Some of you may believe that he is held in popular esteem by certain people of Great Britain because he pictured Sinn Féin leaders and the Sinn Féinners of Ireland as sympathizers of Germany and unworthy of the respect of believers in stable government. While I admit that in season and out his strong talents as a caustic and virile journalist were employed to combat the influence and destroy the power of that element of Irishmen and Irish sympathizers, I assure you that the great number of the people of Great Britain are familiar with like assaults that he has made against the character and the policies of Lloyd George.

Let me quote, if you please, some of the things he has said about this distinguished leader of Great Britain. In Harvey's Weekly of March 30, 1920, he said:

The new Irish bill in the British Parliament surpasses all its predecessors in one important respect. It pleases nobody. Every other one has been acceptable to some party or faction, but this appears to be offensive to everybody from Sir Edward Carson to Mr. Eamonn de Valera. Mr. Lloyd-George has been an immensely adroit opportunist politician, but something more than dexterous opportunism is needed to settle the Irish problem.

Then, in Harvey's Weekly of February 21, he employed this language:

Great Britain—or at least her prime minister—has at last a Russian policy. After two years of indecision, hesitancy, and inconsistency a determination has been made. And, as is not unusual in cases of such paltering and delay, it is wrongly made. The man who sits on the fence too long is very likely to tumble down on the wrong side.

Last week we still supposed that what has now happened was too much for even the complacent Allies to endure. But we were mistaken, at least so far as one of them was concerned. Or we did not make sufficient allowance for the exigencies of a desperate political campaign. For the latter is, of course, the explanation of Mr. Lloyd-George's abject surrender to Lenin and Trotsky. This agile opportunist realizes that he is confronted with the struggle of his life to hold his place in British politics and that the decisive factor in the conflict is the Labor Party. He must placate as much as possible of it at no matter what cost. He can not yield to its nationalizing demands for British industries, for that would alienate more support in other directions than he would thus gain from the Laborites. But he can sacrifice his foreign policy. That will lose him few votes and may gain him many. Therefore, as a considerable faction of the Labor Party is more or less tarred with the bolshevist stick and is clamoring for friendly relations with the soviet government, he yields to its demand.

The antecedent circumstances of this event need to be recalled. A little while ago there was a widespread desire to send relief to the suffering masses of the Russian people, who were hostile to bolshevism, but who because of lack of supplies were unable to make any effective stand against it. But as the bolsheviks controlled the entire coast it was impossible to get supplies to them without permission of the bolsheviks and without their passing through bolshevist hands. The soviet government openly announced that anything shipped into Russia, no matter to whom consigned, would be seized by it and would be devoted to the uses of the bolsheviks first, leaving for the nonbolsheviks only what they might not want, which, of course, would be nothing. That moved the Allies for a time to drop the thought of sending any supplies to Russia. But a fortnight ago the matter was revived, and it was said that arrangements could be made to get supplies intact to the nonbolsheviks. Close upon this, however, came the official notice that no trade with Russia would be permitted unless it was conducted with the soviet government. That, we were rash enough last week to assume, would prevent the Allies from resuming trade.

But it seems that it is no barrier to Mr. Lloyd-George when he is out for Laborite votes. So he announces that normal trade relations will at once be established with the soviet government of Russia. He will not recognize that government politically; oh, no. He is no bolshevist. He is quite ready to fight against it, if need be. But he will trade with it and will ship to the gentle bolsheviks all the supplies they need. That will make them so contented and prosperous that they will stop being bolsheviks and perhaps become bourgeois conservatives. Incidentally, it will win for him a lot of Laborite votes and may secure the support of many non-Laborites who will find profit in trading with the bolsheviks.

It is doubtful if a more flagrant piece of tergiversation was ever effected in British politics or a more hopelessly illogical performance. To say, as Mr. Lloyd-George does, that abandonment of the blockade and resumption of complete trade relations will not constitute making peace with the soviet government.

In Harvey's Weekly, June 19, 1920, he says:

Mr. Lloyd-George appears to prefer traffic with bolsheviks to friendship with France.

His (Lloyd-George's) reception of the bolshevist envoy in Downing Street just as though he were the ambassador of a respectable Government.

Made an agreement to enter into trade relations with him for the purpose of saving the soviet régime from utter collapse. This is, of course, offensive to France and may seriously imperil the confident relations between her and Great Britain.

In the issue of June 19, 1920, under the caption "Two Dispatches," Col. Harvey tells the story of two critical times in the history of the Great War. He tells how on the second critical occasion—

The British war office—in brief, Mr. Lloyd-George—telegraphed peremptorily to Sir Douglas Haig orders which practically read "Go slow. Don't press 'em too hard."

Two dispatches which never should have been written. So Britain may forget the funk of French and the folly of Lloyd-George in the indomitable energy of Kitchener and the serene resolution of Douglas Haig.

Again, on July 10, 1920, in a paragraph criticizing Mr. Lloyd-George's attitude on Mesopotamia, Col. Harvey asks, "Is Lloyd-George among the contemptible quitters?"

In Harvey's Weekly, August 14, 1920, under caption "The Polish Crisis," he says:

Great Britain, however, opposed it (the erection of an independent Polish State) for reasons which may be surmised. One was the strange obsession of deference to Germany. And, second, was a jealous disinclination to permit the rise of a great industrial and commercial power fronting on the Baltic. The third—the influence of that portion of British organized labor which even then sympathized with bolshevism.

On August 28, 1920, under the caption "The Concert of the Powers," he says:

Mr. David Lloyd-George is, like President Wilson, a thorough opportunist, shaping his course by no fixed principles but adapting it day by day to whatever temporary and adventitious circumstances may occur.

In the same periodical on August 8, 1920, under caption "America in Europe," he says:

Mr. David Lloyd-George expresses an earnest hope that after this year's elections "America will again take part in European affairs."

The other reason, * * * for this change of European tone is an ulterior if not sinister design to obtain a quid pro quo. That is to say, America is to be invited, inveigled, or dragged into European affairs in order to give European powers a pretext for intruding into American affairs.

Still, we shall not say that that is what Lloyd-George has in mind.

I shall not burden the RECORD by inserting more, but there are many other utterances that he has made criticizing and antagonizing the policies of Lloyd-George and of Great Britain.

Lloyd-George is to-day the towering figure in the affairs of Great Britain. It has been his tact, his power, and ability that have held his people together and forced the policies that he advocated through the Parliament of that country. Is there any Senator here or any person of ordinary common sense in this country who believes that one who has spoken in the intolerant spirit that George Harvey has manifested in his writings about Lloyd-George and the policies of Great Britain before and during and since the war should be sent as our representative to that country? Is there anyone who could possibly believe that Lloyd-George could ever welcome this representative of America into his confidence? Do you for a moment believe that there could be a happy reception tendered to him upon the part of Lloyd-George and his Government? Is it not reasonable to suppose that in view of these strictures in the utterances of this man touching Lloyd-George, of Great Britain, they will look upon it more as an insult than as an olive branch of friendship and good will? Under what reasoning can one imagine that this individual can exert any influence and win any favor in that country?

Mr. President, there were hundreds of thousands of men and women in the last campaign who voted the Republican ticket not because they believed that the League of Nations should be scrapped but because as they were told by Secretary of State Hughes, Secretary of Commerce Hoover, George W. Wickersham, ex-President William Howard Taft, and thousands of other Republican leaders that the best way to obtain the League of Nations and the ratification of the treaty of Versailles was through the Republican ticket. And there are thousands of men possessing sufficient ability, endowed with the qualities of statesmanship and the arts of diplomacy, who could represent this country at the Court of St. James who would not have made violent and unwise utterances against that country and its leaders that would rise up to plague them.

England, France, Italy, and Belgium, our late allies in the war, whose sons were sacrificed and coffers drained that victory against the entente powers might be won, have agreed to the treaty of Versailles. They have believed that the League of Nations idea, as incorporated in that treaty, was the best means by which wars could be prevented and through which peace be preserved. That institution is now set up. It is functioning. Forty-two other nations have joined hands with them and pledged themselves to uphold it and make it a success. That alliance is growing stronger day by day and those nations are being welded together closer and more securely in the passing of every hour.

Great Britain is one of the most, if not the most, powerful member of that league. Is it possible that no one in America could be found to represent this Government and London except one whose every talent has been employed against the League of Nations idea and who has worked unceasingly not only to prevent our entrance into it, but to misrepresent it and oppose it and destroy it in the minds of the people of the world? Is there any Senator here who would for a moment believe that when George Harvey arrives at the Court of St. James that he can be discreet enough to restrain his feelings in diplomatic conference against the league and that he will not seek the opportunity to force his opinions upon others and use the power of his position to destroy it? I am not unmindful of the word spoken by the President in his inaugural day address and in his first message to the Congress of the United States, virtually saying that we turned our backs on the League of Nations.

I recognize that the last glimmering ray of hope for this country to enter the League of Nations, if his influence prevails, disappeared when he spoke those words. I do not know to what extent he will employ the power of his great office in promoting the association of nations to which he has alluded. I sincerely hope, however, Mr. President, and I shall refuse to believe until I know more about it, that he intends by promoting the proposition of an association of nations to set it up in competition to the workings of the 46 nations of the world who have entered into the League of Nations. I shall refuse to believe that he,

by promoting the association of nations idea, will believe that its success is dependent upon the failure of the League of Nations. I shall refuse to believe that in order to obtain success for his association of nations that he intends to employ the power of his office to disrupt the League of Nations. But I fear very much, Mr. President, that when George Harvey as the ambassador of this country to the Court of St. James arrives in London that there will grow in the minds of the people of that nation, as well as the peoples of the other 45 nations belonging to the league, the idea that he will use whatever influence he may possess and the power of his position in attempts to destroy the League of Nations. It does seem to me, Mr. President, that some man of all the brilliant and well-equipped diplomatists that are enlisted in the ranks of the Republican Party could have been found and nominated for this high post, some man on whom distrust and suspicion would not be fastened.

It may be, Mr. President, as has been suggested in some quarters, that President Harding would rather have George Harvey across the Atlantic than to remain here at home, with the ever-threatening prospect that the friend of to-day might overnight become an unrelenting critic and foe; but, be that as it may, there are millions of patriotic Americans, regardless of party affiliations, who will regard the appointment as a crowning affront to the sick man who recently vacated the White House.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. President, that if this appointment is indicative of what is to follow, if the foreign affairs of this country are to be placed in the hands of such men as George Harvey, and its domestic policies are to be controlled by those tariff barons who favor erecting a barrier against the trade and commerce of other nations, then the future of America is dark, indeed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I did not have an opportunity to hear the opening portion of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], but I think I have heard quite enough of it to gather its full import, and to be able to measure it with justice, and to in no manner criticize where criticism is not due. As I listened to this carefully prepared address, every line of which seemed to indicate that the Senator had been burning the midnight oil and lighting his taper at the fires of venom, I wondered what good purpose was to be served by this address. Mr. Harvey has been appointed ambassador to Great Britain and his appointment has been confirmed. Certainly, to use a much abused but very apt expression, I hold no brief for Mr. Harvey. I have met him but once in my life, and I was then impressed with the fact that he is probably one of the great intellects of this country. I think no man can truthfully challenge his patriotism, and if you combine intellectuality and patriotism, you come very nearly having what is necessary to make a good representative of this Government at the Court of St. James.

I have not agreed with Mr. Harvey in hundreds and thousands of things he has said. I have not agreed with the present President of the United States in many things he has said. I am very seldom able to agree with a rock-ribbed Republican on any policy which gets into matters political. But I recognize the fact that this is a Government by political parties, and it being a Government by political parties, I recognize the right of a President to appoint members of his own party to represent this country in the various courts of the world. Indeed, I think any other policy would be a mistake, and so when he appointed Mr. Harvey, as a Republican, he was within his rights. But I am not obliged, when I say that Mr. Harvey was a proper appointee, to say by that that I personally agree with all Mr. Harvey has ever written.

I was trying, as the Senator proceeded, to find out what his object was. I think I discovered his purpose in the closing sentences of his speech. He declared that our minister to Great Britain ought to be a man acceptable to Great Britain, one in whom the British people would have confidence, whom they would respect, and whom they would receive with cordiality if not affection. That is not his language, but that is his thought. So I presume in an earnest desire that this might be the case he has made the speech to-day in order that when Mr. Harvey goes to the Court of St. James he may bear with him this senatorial indorsement. Clearly the speech was made for the purpose of introducing Mr. Harvey in a very happy way to the British Government so that he might have influence with them as the Senator said he ought to have influence with them.

Mr. President, it is alleged that no newspaper man ought ever to take a political appointment, and the proof of it is that Mr. Harvey, some years ago in delivering an address, said that newspaper men ought not to place themselves in the position of men writing for the purpose of securing political office. That was a very noble sentiment when it was uttered.

It was in fact so exalted that it was like some other theories I have heard of in this world. It does not work out in practical life. If it is to be applied to Mr. Harvey, then it ought to be elsewhere applied. If it applies to him, it ought to apply to Democrats as well as Republicans. How many distinguished journalists did President Wilson send abroad? How many men did he select from that profession? Quite a number; and it was said that it was a very noble thing and a very happy change to quit appointing men to foreign ministries who had simply contributed to campaign funds and to go into the intellectual world and recognize the service of men who with pen or with tongue had rendered a public service. So far as I am concerned I would rather see a man appointed to high office because with his pen he had done brilliant work or with his tongue in the forums of the land he had rendered skillful service than to see him sent to a foreign country because his name appeared at the head of campaign contribution papers.

We may take all the flights of fancy we desire, but the cold truth of the matter is that nearly every man who is ever appointed to public office has done something for a political party. Let me say to you that the man who has never done anything for a political party is, in my judgment, never fit for a political office, because a man who has the interest of his country at heart is always to some extent active in politics. When I find a man who has been too good to help elect a President, I always think he is entirely too worthless to be appointed to office by that President.

Taking part in politics is hardly a crime. Taking part in politics, if it be a crime, is one that has been committed by every Member of this body. If partisanship be a crime, then the Senator from Mississippi could be indicted on a million counts and tried in a thousand forums to-morrow. Taking part in politics is a high virtue and a high duty. When I hear a man say of another that he is a mere politician I recognize the fact, if he means to denounce him simply because he has been active in the politics of the land, that he is denouncing a man who has given to the public his service, his thought, his time, his attention, who has had some interest in his country. The criticism of such a man by a man too indolent, too lazy, too indifferent, or too holy to take part in the affairs of his country is something like a sacrifice itself.

Why do men take these interests in the public life of their country? Do they start out for the purpose of getting office? I suppose there is not a man in this body of politicians, as some people call us, who when he began to take an active interest in politics ever thought of holding office himself. I suppose that is true of the other House. I suppose, and I very earnestly believe, that nearly all of these men took an interest in their country because they loved their country. Having taken that interest, having manifested it actively and efficiently, the time came when there was some demand that they should take their places in the forums of debate and in the halls of legislation, and so they are here not because they covertly schemed from the first for places here, but because they rendered services that proved them qualified for their places.

Of course, there comes a time when a man must say whether he is a candidate or not, and when that time does come he then acts in response to two things—his desire to serve his country, and, of course, his desire to get elected after he has allowed his name to be entered.

About the worst thing we can have in a republic is a lot of men who are too good to take an interest in public affairs. The women of the country sought the right to vote. I did not think they were wise in seeking it, but they obtained it. I say to the women of the country that they have assumed a great duty and a great obligation; that it is no longer a right, it is a high duty, and that it is the business of all women in the country now as patriotic daughters of America to inform themselves about public affairs and take part in public affairs, and when they do so I am not going to refer to them sneeringly as politicians nor assert that they want something for themselves because they do take a public interest.

So, when we boil this thing down, men get their positions for public service. Some of them render it with money, and that is all right if the money is paid in decent amounts. Some of them render it by great speeches, some of them render it by great organizing ability, some of them render it with the mastery of their pen. I have no objection to a newspaper man being recognized any more than I have a man who has made speeches on the platform. I would rather see both of those classes recognized than to see men recognized who have put up nothing but coin of the realm.

Mr. President, let me take up one of the chief charges against Mr. Harvey. It is that he once supported President Wilson and that he afterwards supported the opposite party; that he

supported the opposite party particularly because of a great international question which involved the welfare of the Republic and which affected the welfare of the world. If that was Mr. Harvey's view, did he have a right to express it or did he not? Did he have the right to write against the League of Nations? Has the Senator from Mississippi had the undoubted right to speak for it? Are we to politically excommunicate every man who was against the League of Nations and who did not agree with the Senator from Mississippi? Well, if so, we would exclude one-half of the American people and then 8,000,000 in addition. Are we to exclude everybody who ever said anything against Mr. Taft? I am not going to say anything against him here to-day. I have said a good many things against him in the past, but there has been no tongue more bitter against Taft than the tongue of the Senator from Mississippi.

Are we to exclude everybody who has ever said anything against Roosevelt or who changed from an opinion adverse to Roosevelt to one of kindness? The Senator's own expression was that Harvey had attacked the high ideals of Roosevelt; therefore he was to stand excommunicated. Because he changed his views he is to be excommunicated. But when Roosevelt was running for the Presidency, the Senator from Mississippi went over the country with his strident voice and denounced Roosevelt in terms that were so bitter they literally sizzled as they came through his lips, and yet he is now talking about the high ideals of Roosevelt. If Mr. Harvey is to be condemned because he said something bitter of Mr. Roosevelt some years ago, then the Senator from Mississippi is in his class and must be crucified on the same cross beside him. If he is to be criticized because he afterwards had a kindlier view of Roosevelt, then the Senator from Mississippi must be impaled on a stake just beside him, for he is now prating of the high ideals of Roosevelt and denouncing all who ever said anything against Roosevelt. When he draws that indictment he will have to put himself in as a particeps criminis. That will not do.

But Mr. Harvey said something against Taft, too. So have I; so has the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. KING. So have everybody.

Mr. REED. So have we all on this side. Taft has come out and said some things about me in political debate.

But among other crimes Harvey has committed, he has said something against Herbert Hoover. [Laughter.] Nobody who has ever said anything against Herbert Hoover can be the minister to any place; he is not entitled to the services of a minister even as the shadow of death hovers around his head. He is forever excommunicated and lost.

There comes the Senator from California, HIRAM JOHNSON; he never could be minister anywhere at any time because he has not agreed with Hoover. [Laughter.] The whole people of California, except a few thousand, could also be herded in the same building and burned with the same fire, for they did not take very warmly to Hoover. I have forgotten how many delegates Hoover received in the convention.

Mr. McCORMICK. Which convention?

Mr. REED. Any convention. It is an awful thing to say something about Hoover. If he had been nominated on the Democratic ticket, my friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] would have gone over this country and would have proclaimed him the greatest man save one since the crucifixion. If he had been nominated on the Republican ticket, the Senator from Mississippi would have denounced him as the greatest villain unhung. It just depends with Brother HARRISON on which side of the political fence you are. If you should put the Savior of mankind and the Twelve Apostles in a sanctuary and run the Republican banner up over it, no matter who put the banner up, the Senator from Mississippi would probably denounce them. [Laughter.]

Say something against Hoover! I have said a good many things against Hoover, and I may say more.

Again Mr. Harvey is denounced because he changed his politics. He supported President Wilson with his powerful pen practically up to the time he was nominated. After a period of quiescence he concluded that he would oppose some of the policies of President Wilson, and he finally supported President Harding, because President Harding had announced he was against the things that Mr. Harvey and his paper were against and that the American people were against.

So you must not nominate a man to any office who ever changed his politics. How about Colby? Colby had been the most radical of Republicans. He had marched with the "old guard" until if he heard a fife play at night he would get up in his nightshirt and start a parade. [Laughter.] He had been one of the most venomous critics of the Democratic President, but he changed his politics.

It is true he was like the Swede in the old story who was on the vessel moving out from the dock and somebody said, "Jump, Ole; you can make it in two jumps." [Laughter.] Colby made it in two jumps. He landed over first with the Progressives; then he jumped from that shaky and uncertain platform over into the Democratic ranks; and just as he jumped into the Democratic corral he landed in a seat as Secretary of State. He was not long enough in the corral to get "city broke" before he was made Secretary of State.

Is it a crime to change one's politics? Let us see about it. I remember a letter that was written expressing the devout hope that "somebody would knock Mr. Bryan into a cocked hat"; and I recall the fact that the same gentleman who wrote that letter yanked him into his Cabinet. I do not criticize the late President for that. I think his language was a little intemperate with regard to knocking Bryan into a cocked hat. That was perhaps a little harsher treatment than Bryan had deserved; but the President had a right to change his mind and to conclude that Bryan was a great and good man and the best man he could find in all the country to perform in the dual capacity of Secretary of State and Chautauqua lecturer. [Laughter.] It is all right; he had a right to do it; but does it lie in our mouths to denounce any President who may see fit to appoint a man because that man at some time or other supported a man of a different party on wholly different issues?

Nobody has challenged the personal honor of Mr. Harvey here; no one has challenged his intellectuality. The whole thing rests upon the fact, after all, that he is a virile, fighting Republican, and that he is not for the League of Nations. Well, why should he be? [Laughter.] Why should anybody except a political idiot go around hugging to his bosom a corpse that has been interred? [Laughter.] There is told an old, old story—and I never think of anything but old stories—of two Irishmen who were teasing a snapping turtle with a stick. The turtle would grab on and hold very tightly until finally one of them cut the turtle's head off, but still the jaws shut in the stick and hung on. One Irishman said: "Mike, look at him; he is holding on after he is dead." The other replied, "Of course he is dead, but the fool don't know it." [Laughter.]

We are talking about the League of Nations yet. Let us see about it. We lost every State north of the Mason and Dixon line, and we lost by about 150,000 majority the good old State of Missouri, that, with one exception, has been solidly in the Democratic column ever since they let the people vote down there. We lost the State of New York by about two million—or was it two and a half million? We lost Tennessee; we lost Oklahoma; we lost Kentucky.

Mr. STERLING. And New Mexico.

Mr. REED. New Mexico has always been a little uncertain. There are so many "greasers" down there that it is no wonder it sometimes goes Republican. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. And Nevada and Arizona.

Mr. REED. We lost Arizona, and we would have lost Georgia if it had not been that Hardwick was nominated for governor and Watson for the Senate; and it took all their personal appeals to save that State going into the Republican Party, although the Republican Party had made the idiotic blunder of appointing a colored gentleman as a member of the Republican national committee from that State, and that gentleman was the man who got \$9,200 of swag and was known all over Georgia as the "Georgia \$9,000 peach." Wipe out the question of color, and I do not know what State we would have carried down South, although perhaps we would have carried some of them.

Now, there may be some who want to make the race again with that old corpse tied on their backs as a handicap and follow the lead of this disembodied and discredited ghost, but, so far as I am concerned, I have had quite enough of it.

It is said this man is sent over to discredit the League of Nations. He is undoubtedly sent over to say to Great Britain what President Harding has said to the American people and the world in two great utterances, that we will not go into the League of Nations; that if they want a League of Nations they can have it; that if they have 46 nations in it, and if it is any good, the 46 nations can run it to suit themselves; but a League of Nations that has 46 nations in it and that can not stand up unless the United States puts its arms around it and holds it up and totes it home, like you would an imbecile drunkard at 2 o'clock in the morning, is not worth holding up; it costs too much money.

The astonishing thing is that this question should be brought before this body again under the circumstances. We have witnessed the performance of these 46 nations, members of the league, who were going to take charge of the whole world,

and almost all of the universe, and run it in accordance with high ideals; under which there was to be no selfishness, no heartlessness, no cupidity; in which all were to meet around the table and settle everything in accordance with the very right of every matter. We have watched them perform, and we have witnessed since the war a spectacle that ought to cause every man who has ever been for that instrument to be now convinced by the eternal logic of indisputable facts that he was mistaken.

How has the league functioned and how have the countries in it performed? In the name of absolute equity, and prating of the rights of weak peoples, they seized the continent of Africa at the point of the bayonet. Declaring that they desired nothing except the protection of their own rights, they invaded the rights of every people, everywhere, who are not able with force to repeal their invasion. The northern portion of Africa was divided between Italy, France, and England, and 22,000,000 of our allies in Egypt who furnished armies for the allied cause found as they laid down their arms and shouldered their banners that the manacles of British slavery were put upon their wrists; and when their representatives started to this high court—the league—where equity was to rule and justice was to control, they were imprisoned and denied the right either to a hearing or to a trial.

It was manifested again when in the Shantung we turned over to Japan the very heart of China, with her 38,000,000 protesting Chinamen, who uttered their protest to the deaf ears of those who had been their allies; and we took this from China even while her yellow men were digging trenches beneath the hail of German shrapnel and were dying from the poison of German gases in the trenches they were digging for the English and the French. And to-day the invasion of China goes on. Step by step and inch by inch and day by day and mile by mile it proceeds, until gradually the whole of that country is being brought beneath the silent but the determined enthrallment of Japan.

How else did we act? Russia lay there. She had been under an autocratic form of government, the vilest that had defaced the modern world. From four to six million of her people had been killed in the war. They overthrew their Government and finally quit the fight. They set up a government which I abominate, because I do not believe in its principles; but it came nearer being a government of the people of Russia than the people of Russia ever had, bad as it is. The old Government of Russia represented 1 per cent of the people, and they held 99 per cent of the property. The new government of Russia, bad as it is, represents a much larger element of the people, and they have taken over some of the property of their former oppressors. But there they were, engaged in their own struggle, and they were invaded from four sides by four armies—one of them under the banner of France, one under the banner of Japan, one under the Union Jack, and one under the Stars and Stripes—and to what purpose? In order to aid somebody to set up some other kind of a government over a people that did not want that government, and that have demonstrated that they did not want that kind of a government on many a bloody field from that day to this.

How has this spirit of equity worked out? We gave Poland her liberty, a free gift. We fed her, and we helped to arm her. We fixed her boundaries, and the next day after we had fixed them her soldiers marched 300 miles into territory to which they had no claim on earth, and undertook to take it by the force of the sword. And so you find everywhere that the very men who were to sit about this board and deal justice and equity, who were to relieve every weak people and strike from their wrists their shackles, have been all the time busy with anvil and hammer rewelding the chains upon their arms; and still men talk about a league of nations!

We talk about self-determination by small peoples. That hope was held out to the world, and that was one of the things that was to be accomplished by this league; but the first thing Great Britain did was to take article 10, as carried over to them, and change it. That article as it was filed directly pledged to every small people the right to a hearing and release upon a two-thirds vote by the international tribunal. All those clauses were stricken out of it, and it was left an absolute guaranty that the armies and navies of the United States and of the world would stand ready to slaughter any people that dared strike for their liberties.

That is the thing we are prating of now; and because a man opposed that, he can not go to represent us in a foreign country. That is the sum total of this man's offending. If, having announced his doctrine that we would not go into the League of Nations, President Harding has sent a proleague man, to

Great Britain, he would have stood before the country convicted by his act of the insincerity of his words.

They say Mr. Harvey blasphemed the Holy Virgin. I have here the cartoon which the Senator from Mississippi produced. There is not a man in this body who would recognize in it any blasphemy of anything holy or sacred. He would not even know what picture it was supposed to be copied from except that there is at the top of this cartoon the legend, "Prof. Wilson's League of Nations, the Immaculate Conception."

I admit that the cartoon was a bitter cartoon, but of what? Of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin? By no means. It was a cartoon of the claim made by some people that the League of Nations was an inspired thing—a sentiment that had been sacrilegiously promulgated by the proponents of this league on every platform in America. Everywhere the people were told that this was almost of divine origin; and so Harvey's cartoonist—whom I happen to know, for he used to live in my little town of Kansas City—conceived the idea that he would satirize that, and he drew a picture of Uncle Sam in the middle of a portrait scattering dollars out to Europe, and below him Brother Cox trying to hang a picture on the wall, and so the picture bears the legend, "Prof. Wilson's League of Nations, the Immaculate Conception; Having Difficulty in Hanging the Masterpiece."

Now, that was seized on in the political campaign. An attempt was made to give it the cast before the public mind that Mr. Harvey had undertaken to cast aspersions upon the virginity of Mary, the mother of Christ. Of course, it was cheap political claptrap then, as it is cheap political claptrap now; but, of course, it was a dangerous thing, and so no doubt Mr. Harvey disclaimed it, and afterwards, in order to make himself perfectly plain, after the election was over and he had nothing to gain, Mr. Harvey printed a statement in which he disclaimed any such purpose, expressed astonishment that that construction was given, and made an abject apology, if you please to term it that, to the American people that anything got in his columns that anybody could torture into a reflection upon the Christian religion; and after that it is dragged in here in the Senate!

I confess that I think the cartoonist made a tactical mistake, but that anybody meant to offend against religion is ridiculous.

Mr. President, I have only a word or two more to say.

We are told that Mr. Harvey criticized Lloyd-George, and we had the criticisms read here, and they are just about the same kind of criticisms that you read in every newspaper in this land, Democratic and Republican. They said that Lloyd-George was confronted with difficulties; that he was shifting his position; that he was a clever and adroit manager of public opinion, and things to that effect. Is there anybody who doubts that that is true? Lloyd-George would not deny it. Nobody can deny it. He has had a hard time to keep his feet under him, and I think he has shown a great deal of genius in the way he has accomplished results; and he could not have done it if he had stood hard and fast upon some particularly fixed position. I have no brief for him, either. I have a good many things against Lloyd-George, and the worst one against him is what he is doing in Ireland to-day.

But what is the object of this speech? England has already accepted this man. Lloyd-George is already content with him. If he had not been, his name never would have been sent to the Senate, because inquiry is always made before a man is appointed as ambassador or minister to these countries. I do not know the facts in this case; I simply infer it because it is a custom that I think is never varied from.

Mr. President, I am sorry to differ from a Democrat. I have been differing from them on occasions, and I would like to get where I would not have to differ from them. I can see no reason for this assault on this man, when he goes there, in my opinion, with an intellectual equipment the equal of any possessed by any minister at the Court of St. James in the last 50 years, a thoroughgoing American patriot, a man who proposes to help keep us out of European entanglements, who, if he has not always agreed with some gentlemen, at least has kept true to the faith of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson upon that great question. It seems to me it would be well, if we are concerned in promoting amity and good will in Europe, in having our ministers exercise a great influence there, that we should not send them away with three hours' defamation trailing after them.

MR. LODGE. Mr. President, in the course of my service here I have on one or two occasions been opposed to the confirmation of a Justice of the Supreme Court, but if the Senate decided in favor of the man selected, when he became a justice my lips were absolutely closed, as those of all other opponents

should be, for after his selection is perfected he no longer represents a party; he becomes a representative of the country in the administration of justice. In the same way, when a man is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a post abroad, he ceases to be the representative of a party and becomes the representative of the United States; he represents all Americans in the foreign country to which he goes.

I think that it is very unfortunate that the Senate, which has just confirmed Mr. Harvey, should be forced to listen to this attack upon him, because the attack is leveled at a man who represents the United States of America, and while he does he should receive, especially in this body which confirmed him, the respect which his great office commands.

Mr. President, I reported the nomination. I did so with great pleasure. Mr. Harvey had been all his life, until the last few years, a very strong Democrat, a very bitter Democrat, if you please, for your native State, Mr. President, does not breed many Democrats, but those it produces are apt to be very strong in what they are pleased to call their political faith. Mr. Harvey for years fought the battles of the Democratic Party. He assailed vigorously the candidates of the Republican Party.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has taken pains to quote here what Mr. Harvey said about President Roosevelt and about President Taft. There is no occasion to enter on any defense of President Roosevelt. His fame is secure; his monument is a noble part of our history. Mr. Harvey then said things about him very repellant to me, but when in later days he came to know Col. Roosevelt he recognized very fully, before the colonel's death, the greatness of the man whom he had formerly attacked. What he said in earlier days was only what other Democrats were trying to say, but what he said was remembered, because it was said better and more effectively than what the other Democrats said. He had the faculty of writing in a way to be remembered.

The other charge, which seems to be serious, is that Mr. Harvey changed his party, and changed it on account of the treatment he received from Mr. Wilson. I suppose he did as much as, if not more than, any man in the country, or perhaps any group of men, to bring Mr. Wilson into the presidential field and to make him the candidate of the Democratic Party, and Mr. Wilson selected that moment, when the nomination was coming within his grasp, to tell Mr. Harvey, in language not too polite, that his services were no longer needed. I suppose it rather surprised Mr. Harvey. He was then and in that way entering upon the voyage of discovery in regard to Mr. Wilson which the country entered upon, and is he to be blamed because he found out a little earlier than the rest of the country about Mr. Wilson and his peculiarities?

The vote at the last election was not delivered against Mr. Cox; he was merely a name. The huge Republican, I might say American, majority in the last election was directed at Mr. Wilson and all that he represented.

Mr. Harvey, after Mr. Wilson discarded him for two years, sustained the administration, which I think was not a little surprising under the circumstances. But Mr. Harvey knows now that he was only the first of many conspicuous instances of men who had been loyal and helpful, but who, venturing to disagree with Mr. Wilson, were pushed out into the highways and byways of politics with a coolness of ingratitude which I think has been rarely equaled. You can find examples, from Mr. Garrison and Mr. Bryan on through a long list concluding with Mr. Lansing, of men who had served Mr. Wilson with the utmost fidelity and even with subservience, as people said, but who had dared at some point to hold a different opinion, and whether they were in the Cabinet, where they were easily reached, or in some other appointive office, or whether they held places in the Senate or the House, they were pursued with the same vindictiveness everywhere.

Mr. Harvey happened to be the earliest of the victims of Mr. Wilson's methods, and, as I said, he delayed for two years before he opposed Mr. Wilson, and when he did it was not then on any personal ground, in my judgment, but because he believed that Mr. Wilson was entering upon a policy abroad which he thought was fatal to the interests of the United States; and he left him, and he had two or three million go with him before the thing was over.

He fought a good fight against the league. He was one of the powerful influences, beyond doubt, against it. He joined the Republican Party and supported its candidates, and when the election came he was of great service to the present President of the United States. The high office to which he has been called went to him without a suggestion or an application on his part, because Mr. Harding, like some of our other Presidents in the past, prior to Mr. Wilson and the "new freedom,"

was not unmindful of those who had served the cause and supported him in the contest.

Mr. President, one of the other attacks made upon Mr. Harvey was in relation to the unfortunate cartoon which appeared in his paper, and appeared without his knowledge, though he did not shirk responsibility, and which some Democrats undertook to use as an issue, although it was disclaimed not only by Col. Harvey, but, of course, by President Harding and by the chairman of the Republican national committee. Those, however, who attempted to use it in that way as an issue overlooked the fact that the cartoon, which was obnoxious to all Christians of all sects, was less offensive than the attempt to make political capital out of it. In those States where they vote and have elections and an unrestrained public opinion the attempt to make political capital out of that cartoon reacted upon those who did it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. The cartoon originally was a political cartoon, was it not?

Mr. LODGE. It certainly was.

Mr. HARRISON. It was a cartoon gotten up by Mr. Reid, who was in the employ of the Republican national campaign committee, was it not?

Mr. LODGE. That is absolutely true, and, I repeat, it appeared by a mistake; it was disclaimed by all; but the Senate will find what I have just said about the election to be true, that the people whom that deplorable cartoon shocked—and it shocked everybody—disliked even more the attempt to make political capital out of such a subject.

Mr. President, just one word more. Mr. Harvey is a man of great ability, and no one denies it. He is a man of wide reading and an unusual knowledge of foreign relations. He is a thoroughly patriotic American and he is an American through and through. He has rendered great services in a cause which he had at heart and in sustaining the policies of Washington and Monroe, and in this the American people, by about 7,000,000 majority, agreed with him. It seems to me such ability and public service fit him to represent this country abroad. He was nominated by the President and confirmed by an overwhelming majority in this body. He has been accepted by the country to which he was accredited, formally and officially, and I think it is a sorry piece of personal or party hatred to make the Senate a vehicle of attacking a man of that character, fitted for the office which he is going to assume in another country, where he represents the United States of America, and trying to injure him as the representative of the United States, for what purpose I do not pretend to say. I think it is a nomination in all ways fit to be made; I am glad the Senate confirmed him. I trust, at least, it will be understood abroad that the voice of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] does not represent the opinion of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator before he takes his seat permit a question? His last expression evidently was intended as a criticism of me in making the speech at this time after the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator caught my meaning. That was my intention.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator will recall that when the nomination came before the Senate in open session of the Senate, I asked unanimous consent that it be considered in open executive session, and that when the Senator himself objected to that I moved that it be considered in open executive session, and was voted down by the other side of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Only one objection was needed.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but the Senator made it.

Mr. LODGE. There was no need of a vote. The Senator made the request. My objection, one objection, was enough to deny it. I do not think nominations ought to be discussed in public, and, although what has happened to-day does not come strictly within the rule as to executive sessions, it violates the spirit of the rule. It is to prevent just such scenes as these that nominations have always been considered in secret session, and until this time, so far as I am aware, no attempt has been made to depart from that policy, directly or indirectly, in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I shall occupy a few moments of the time of the Senate. What we may say now about Mr. Harvey will not affect his possession of the position that he holds. I voted against his confirmation because I did not think him truly a great representative of the great American people. I wondered in my own mind who wished him on the President,

I doubt seriously if we had polled this body of Senators, Democrats and Republicans, and had asked them what man should be selected to represent us at the Court of St. James, if there is a Senator on either side who would have selected George Harvey. There is not a Senator on either side, I dare say, who would have thought of him. But he has been appointed and the President had a right to appoint him. We all concede that. I am not criticizing the appointment now. I voted against him for the reason that I have stated.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is mixed up in his history about the difference between President Wilson and Mr. Harvey. He suggested, as I understood him, that Mr. Harvey differed with the President, because he saw him leading out on certain foreign policies that he could not agree to. The fact is that Mr. Wilson and Mr. Harvey had their falling out before Mr. Wilson was nominated the first time for President.

Mr. LODGE. I was aware of that. I stated that. It was just at the time of the nomination that Wilson threw him overboard, but he supported him in his publications for two years after that.

Mr. HEFLIN. He did support him?

Mr. LODGE. He did, for nearly two years.

Mr. HEFLIN. But the difference that arose between them was before Wilson was first nominated and prior to his election.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly it was. It was so stated by the Senator from Mississippi, and correctly stated.

Mr. HEFLIN. My recollection of the explanation of the difference between them at that time was that Mr. Harvey undertook to bring certain influences to bear upon President Wilson from a source of special interests which the President would not stand for, and that the difference grew out of that, and that he practically told Mr. Harvey he could not dictate his policies or control him. I remember hearing reports to that effect at the time.

Mr. LODGE. That is perfectly true. That was all stated by the Senator from Mississippi. What I said was that Mr. Harvey continued to support him until he believed that he was betraying his country, to put it in plain English, and then he left him.

Mr. HEFLIN. It may be that he was supporting him with the same enthusiastic ardor that Mr. Lansing was when he kept his diary all the time while he was at the peace conference in Paris. How ridiculous the position that he occupied, this Secretary of State, supposed friend and confidential adviser of the Chief Executive at the peace conference in Paris, keeping a diary, getting up data to write a book attacking his chief, when he got back home, and the whole gist of his story is "How and why the President got rid of me."

I think Mr. Harvey supported President Wilson with just as much sincerity as Lansing supported him while at Paris, and no more. If I had been the President, I should have gotten rid of Lansing long before he did. He never was big enough to be Secretary of State. If you will read his book, I think you will agree with me. He has a grievance that he is trying to show to the American people. He is trying to free himself from the serious indictment of being unfaithful to the man who had honored and trusted him.

Mr. Harvey has rendered valuable and very valiant service to the Republican Party, and the Republican Party has the right to reward him if it wants to do so. We all concede that. It has rewarded him. It has given him a very high and honored position, and I trust that he will make good in it. I am not criticizing the President. I repeat, I wonder who wished him on the President. I wonder what members of the political machinery of the Republican Party singled this man out back yonder when the campaign was on and designated him as a fit subject for special favor. It may be that they decided to profit by the experience of President Wilson, and rather than say or do anything to ruffle Mr. Harvey's feelings they would "soft soap" him and get him out of the country, because he has been known to quickly change his views and turn his back upon a proposition if it did not suit him or if he wearied of a consistent course. They wanted the rolling ocean between them and George Harvey while the steam roller of the Republican Party was working in the United States.

Well, he is over there, and he has my good wishes as an officer of my country. I want him to make a good ambassador. I have not anything against him personally. I spoke with him once at a banquet. We sat side by side at the banquet table. He is an able man in a way. I do not regard him as being the great man that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] seems to think he is. I think that we have a great many men more capable than he is of representing this great Government as ambassador to Great Britain. I did not send him there, and I am not criti-

cizing the President for appointing him. I am still curious to know who wished him on the President. The Senator from Missouri seems to have some sort of grievance against the League of Nations. We rarely ever hear him make a speech that he does not mount that old league nag and ride him around and around in this Chamber. Whenever I see him throw his spurs into the flank of that helpless old horse I know just about what is going to happen. This habit is getting a little old. He talks about the Democrats losing Missouri. There are a good many reasons why we lost Missouri. The fact is, Mr. President, that if the Republicans had been in power during the World War they would have lost in the election last fall, and the Democrats would have been placed in charge of the Government. I think a great many Republicans will agree to that. There were so many people who had grievances, so many people who were disappointed and sore about one thing and another that they naturally wanted a chance to hit something or somebody. We happened to be in power, and they hit the Democratic Party.

Now your troubles begin. You went to every disappointed and disgruntled group of people in the country and you said to them, "You have been mistreated by the Democrats; you are weary and heavy laden; lean on me." To each and every group you said, "We have the panacea for all your troubles, and just as soon as we get in we will use the balm of Gilead and all will be well with you." You said, "These Democrats do not know how to handle the situation. They have made a botch of the whole thing."

Now, you Republicans are in and what have you done? You come along and indorse the President's Mexican policy. You indorse his Russian policy. You have indorsed his Yap Island policy, while many "yaps" are still running at large. You have indorsed his Colombian treaty, and the able and eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] came mighty near precipitating a panic in this body yesterday afternoon when he introduced his amendment. He had some of them changing on that side as quickly, one position to another, as the old fellow said the weather changed in Texas. He wrote a letter to his brother back in Alabama and said, "If you have not started to Texas, don't. This is the most hellacious climate in the world. On yesterday while driving a yoke of steers across the prairie one of them had a sunstroke and while I was skinning him the other one froze to death."

So when the Senator from Idaho introduced the amendment stating that we had not done anything wrong to Colombia, and almost succeeded in getting it adopted, there was more mental anguish on the other side of this Chamber than I have seen over there in a long time. He even had the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] changing his position as quickly as the weather changed in Texas. He did it even more quickly than George Harvey did when he forsook the standard of President Wilson and wandered off in the wilderness.

But you Republicans are in now and you are going to tear down the last vestige of the Wilson administration. In the speech of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] at your convention he used these words, as I recall his speech, "We intend to wipe out the last vestige of the Wilson administration." Well, Mr. President, I have cited four vestiges that you have retained and still you hold on to them.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator omitted Mesopotamia.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

When, let me ask, is this tearing down to begin? You have destroyed the greatest hope of the human race for peace on earth and good will to men. You have failed to accept the greatest peace program ever submitted to the civilized world and helped to cripple and break down the greatest peace advocate since Christ walked the dusty highways of Judea. They may slander and traduce him. Mr. President, he may be lame and halt, God bless him, health broken in his efforts for world peace, but Woodrow Wilson will live in the hearts of the American people and live on the brightest pages of American history long after his slanderers and traducers are dead and forgotten.

I know that the gun and munition makers rejoice that the league of nations is defeated. I know that they made their millions and hundreds of millions out of this business during the war. We needed that material and implements to win the war, and I rejoice that we were able to get them. But I think that the gun and munition makers should have been content with the great profits that they made during the war and that they should not have favored a program that opposed a movement in the interest of a tribunal to prevent war in the future. This Government, we are told, is to-day seeking to provide itself with the deadliest war implements known.

Germany is doing the same thing. France, Great Britain, all other countries that are able to do so, are seeking to provide something that will be an improvement over the terrible poisonous gases and liquid fire which were used in the war just ended. What does it all mean? Instead of working for peace we are getting ready for another war.

The League of Nations contained a provision for disarmament; it contained a provision for arbitration. When this Nation failed to enter the league we failed to take advantage of the opportunity that was ours to employ these two mighty international agencies to prevent war. The league has here been defeated; I am not going into a discussion of that question now; but I want to tell you, briefly, what you did when you defeated it. You lost the greatest opportunity that this Nation has ever had to go out and get the trade of the world. There we were upon a mountain top that overlooked the world, enshrined in the affectionate regard of the nations of the earth. They loved America. They said, "Look at her, that giant force of the western world! She is not out for military conquest; she is out for the good of the human race and peace in the world; she desires, above all things, to prevent war; she wants an international tribunal to settle disputes without murdering men by the millions and tearing out the heartstrings of the wives and mothers of the countries of the world." But we said, "No; we will not go into the league; we will stay out of it, for we are afraid you might try to lead us off into some path of internationalism that we do not want to travel." Then President Wilson said, "We will fix it so that we can retire from the league in two years' time." Mr. Root, of New York, I believe, suggested five years, but President Wilson said, "No; two years is long enough." So we had the opportunity, after being in the league for two years, to retire from it if we chose so to do. We had our boys over there fighting for more than two years. Surely we could put our signature to a document that would bind us to a movement that looked toward peace and nonparticipation in war that held for only two years, but the opponents of the league said no.

Now, in what position do we find ourselves? The league was not accepted by this country. Our trade relations with the Old World are torn to pieces. The farmers of America are selling their produce below the cost of production, while others who enjoy special privileges as they manufacture implements for another war clip their coupons in their places of business.

What would have happened if we had gone into the league? We would have had trade relations established with Russia; we would have had trade relations established with Germany; we would probably have extended credits to both; all of our agricultural products would have sold above the cost of production, aye, at a profit to our farmers, and we would not have been suffering as we are suffering to-day. So when Senators rejoice in their work that resulted in defeating the League of Nations, I want them to remember that they helped to produce the wreck and ruin seen around us here at home.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] talks about the great State of Georgia almost going for the Republican Party last fall. I live down in Alabama, side by side with dear old Georgia, and I never heard of that all during the campaign. I do not know how the Senator from Missouri got such an impression.

Mr. REED. I received it from the present governor of Georgia.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the Senator refer to Mr. Hardwick?

Mr. REED. Yes; who will be inaugurated as governor of Georgia next month.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Hardwick is a very clever, bright gentleman, and he was elected governor. It frequently happens, however, that a fellow thinks that if he had not been nominated the ticket would have been defeated. There is a good deal of human nature in a thing like that. I do not think that the ticket would have been defeated even if his opponent had been nominated. I think the Democratic ticket would have been elected in Georgia, anyway. The League of Nations had nothing on earth to do with the ticket in Tennessee. I do not think it figured much in Oklahoma. We carried Kentucky, although the Senator from Missouri says we lost it. Gov. Cox carried Kentucky; I want the Senator from Missouri to keep his figures straight while he is lambasting the League of Nations almost every time he makes a speech in the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Democrats lost a Senator in Kentucky, which was the thing that counted.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; I am very sorry we lost the Democratic Senator, Senator Beckham; able, fine man he is. A great Democrat and statesman.

But, Mr. President, the falling price of farm products at that time hurt the party in power much more in Oklahoma and Tennessee than did anything else.

I wish to say this to Senators before I take my seat: I stand ready to help the Republican Party do something that will aid our people here at home. I want to say further that we have got to establish some sort of relationship with the outside world. We can not live to ourselves alone. God Almighty intended that this great Republic of the West should lead in the family of nations. We are the richest Government on the globe and the greatest nation in all the world; and yet here we are folding our hands and drawing up into a shell while the Old World is staggering and dying of starvation. They want to have trade relations established with us, and our bankers were ready to form associations to extend credits to Germany and to other European countries for from three to five years, thus giving them a chance to get on their feet, and this would have been helpful to our people here at home. When we did not go into the league, the bankers of America would not put a dollar over there in Europe any more than they would stand and pitch dollars into Niagara Falls. Why? Because with us out of the league they did not know what was going to happen; whether it would be chaos, anarchy, bolshevism, or whatnot. However, if we had gone into the league, at the first meeting the League of Nations would have said to Russia, "We want you to have an election and decide what manner of government you want; you were an ally; we are your friends; set up some sort of an orderly government and we will recognize it." We would have recognized it over here and extended credits to it. We would have extended credit to Germany. There would not have been the distress and suffering that we now witness abroad nor in the United States.

Cotton would have sold for a good price, as would also corn and wheat.

I talked to-day to a northern gentleman who was at the White House to-day with me and others in a gathering which called upon the President in the interest of the farmers of the United States. He said, "I saw the other day a carload of potatoes sell at 7 cents a bushel, and I know the man who produced them paid more than \$4 a bushel for the seed potatoes he planted from which that carload of potatoes grew." Seven cents a bushel! My heart goes out to the farmer who suffers such losses. I can say to Senators here to-day that I have seen the farmers in my section who produced cotton at a cost of 30 cents a pound, in 1920, haul it to the market place and sell it for 12 cents a pound—18 cents below the cost of production. If we had been in the League of Nations, Russia and Germany would have taken every bale of cotton that we had to sell; they would have taken everything to eat that we had to sell; and the farmers of America, who are suffering to-day, would not have had to bear the awful burden that is now upon them. The failure to go into the League of Nations cost the farmers, merchants, and bankers of the South and West billions of dollars.

Mr. President, I hope to see something done that will relieve these people. I do not care whether you call it a League of Nations or not. If the President wants to call it "an association of nations," all well and good. If it is desired to strike out article 10, strike it out; but let us do something; let America take her place in world affairs and play her part. We are the only nation on earth whose highest judicial authority has declared it to be a Christian Nation; and it is the duty of this Nation under God to lead on and on in the interest of peace on earth and good will to men. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are further demonstrations in the galleries, the galleries will be cleared.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if I could have had my way I would have preferred that this discussion had not taken place. That which has brought it about, the nomination of Mr. Harvey, is in the past, and I would not now intrude myself upon the Senate if it were not for the fact that I believe I am the only Senator on this side of the Chamber who voted against his confirmation. If I had come into the Chamber before the debate had closed in executive session, I would have said there what I should have liked to have said when I entered the Chamber while the roll was being called. No good can come now from a discussion of his qualifications, and I am not going to indulge in that kind of a discussion. He has been confirmed, properly and legally, and I only hope that he will "make good."

It has been said here by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that Woodrow Wilson was possessed of a temperament that led him, where he was able to do so, to drive to destruction, with all the power at his command, every man in public life with whom he did not agree. I coincide with that opinion. I do not agree with the Senator from Mississippi in his defense of the ex-President. It may be that some things have been said in criticism of him that I would not approve,

but I confess that of all the criticisms I have ever heard or read about him, I have no fault to find with any of them, and believe that everything that I have ever heard or read was justified under the circumstances. Mr. Harvey, in my judgment, is of the Wilson type. A great many good things can be said about him, but Mr. Harvey has pursued with the same venom every man who has not agreed with him and has done the best he could to disgrace him and drive him out of public life by methods which I believe are disreputable and dishonorable.

It is said in his defense that he is a highly intellectual gentleman and is patriotic. I agree with both of those suggestions, Mr. President, and I think the same thing could be said about President Wilson; but there are many men possessing those two attributes; in fact, thousands of them, in insane asylums. I do not mean to say that either one of those attributes tends toward insanity, but a man possessing no other attributes than those two may lack in a great many other respects qualifications that he ought to have in order to make an acceptable ambassador.

I believe Mr. Harvey lacks in some of those respects. I am satisfied that my opinion is concurred in by a vast majority of the Senate. A great many Members of the Senate have talked to me since I have voted against his confirmation and have said that they thought his nomination was a mistake; they would have preferred that it had been somebody else. But there seems to be a general feeling that the President ought to have a free hand—and I am rather inclined to concur in that—in selecting these nominees. Certainly Mr. Harvey has no claim upon the Republican Party, unless his brief service in that party entitles him to outstrip those who have spent their lives in the advocacy of its principles. It does not follow from that, however, that he would not make a good diplomat. I myself am not urging any objection to him on that ground.

I could not, Mr. President, even if I were inclined to do so, go now into the discussion of what I believe to be the reasons why he will not make a good diplomat. I hope I was not influenced in my vote by personal reasons. If I was, I was unconscious of the influence, although I realize that we are sometimes influenced unconsciously by personal reasons. I certainly had them, but I thought I was built on a broader plan. They are not of any particular importance, however, especially now; and I would not have burdened the Senate by saying anything about the matter if it had not been that this discussion has led to some of the things that Mr. Harvey has done.

For instance, he was an opponent of the League of Nations, and it is said that he did great service in that fight. I think he did. I agreed with him in that fight. I think that in that fight these few Senators here whom I followed and who led in that great contest performed a service not only for this country but for the world the magnitude of which the people will realize in future years. I think they saved not only our Nation but humanity, and Mr. Harvey did everything that he could in that contest. But, Mr. President, again I might say that there are thousands of men who were opposed to the League of Nations who have perhaps committed crime and gone to the penitentiary before this time. That attribute alone is not enough to qualify a man for this great place.

Admitting that Mr. Harvey has done valiant service, admitting his patriotism, admitting his great ability, I believe that he possesses the same attributes that are possessed in a superlative degree by Woodrow Wilson that unfit either one of them for the position of the diplomat.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senate of the Sixty-seventh Congress is proceeding upon a strange hypothesis. The objections to the Colombian treaty were discussed mainly from the viewpoint that its ratification would be a reflection upon the memory of Theodore Roosevelt. The confirmation of Col. Harvey has proceeded upon the viewpoint of what may or may not be the view of former President Wilson. I protest against dragging personalities into these questions and thereby obscuring the main issue.

It has been insinuated that in the Harvey-Wilson episode in 1911 and 1912 there was something savoring of impoliteness on the part of Woodrow Wilson, then governor of New Jersey. In order that the country may have, if it be interested, the whole correspondence that ensued between these two gentlemen at that time, I am going to read it all; and the conduct of President Wilson was that of the accurate gentleman, and the same was true of Col. Harvey.

It will be remembered that the following memorandum was made by Col. Henry Watterson, who was present at the interview where the former President is alleged to have requested Col. Harvey to cease support of him, Gov. Wilson:

GEORGE HARVEY. Is there anything left of that cheap talk during the gubernatorial campaign about my advocating you on behalf of "the interests"?

WOODROW WILSON (with great positiveness). Yes; there is. I lunched to-day with two of the young men in my literary bureau, and they both declared it was having a serious effect in the West. I did not ask them for the information. They volunteered it.

GEORGE HARVEY. Have you thought of any way to counteract this harmful effect?

WOODROW WILSON. I have not. In fact, I am greatly perplexed to know how to do it. I have been able to satisfy those I could reach, but there are thousands, of course, whom we can not reach. I have not yet been able to devise a way to meet the situation.

GEORGE HARVEY. Is there anything I can do, except, of course, to stop advocating your nomination?

WOODROW WILSON. I think not. At least, I can't think of anything. GEORGE HARVEY. Then I will simply sing low.

(Pause. Silence from Woodrow Wilson.)

COL. HENRY WATTERSON. Yes; that's the only thing to do. The power of silence is very great. For myself, too, I shall not say a word for the present.

(Quite a long pause.)

WOODROW WILSON. Good day, gentlemen.

(Henry Watterson and George Harvey nod responses.)

(Exit Woodrow Wilson.)

Some days later the following letter was sent by Gov. Wilson to Col. Harvey:

(Personal.)

UNIVERSITY CLUB,
FIFTH AVENUE AND FIFTY-FOURTH STREET,
December 21, 1911.

MY DEAR COLONEL: Every day I am confirmed in the judgment that my mind is a one-track road and can run only one train of thought at a time! A long time after that interview with you and Marse Henry at the Manhattan Club it came over me that when (at the close of the interview) you asked me that question about the Weekly I answered it simply as a matter of fact, and of business, and said never a word of my sincere gratitude to you for all your generous support, or of my hope that it might be continued. Forgive me, and forget my manners!

Faithfully, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

To which letter Col. Harvey sent the following reply:

(Personal.)

FRANKLIN SQUARE,
New York, January 4, 1912.

MY DEAR GOV. WILSON: Replying to your note from the University Club, I think it should go without saying that no purely personal issue could arise between you and me. Whatever anybody else may surmise, you surely must know that in trying to arouse and further our political aspirations during the past few years I have been actuated solely by the belief that I was rendering a distinct public service.

The real point at the time of our interview was, as you aptly put it, one simply "of fact and of business," and when you stated the fact to be that my support was hurting your candidacy, and that you were experiencing difficulty in finding a way to counteract its harmful effect, the only thing possible for me to do, in simple fairness to you, no less than in consideration of my own self-respect, was to relieve you of your embarrassment so far as it lay within my power to do so, by ceasing to advocate your nomination. That, I think, was fully understood between us at the time, and, acting accordingly, I took down your name from the head of the Weekly's editorial page some days before your letter was written. That seems to be all there is to it.

Whatever little hurt I may have felt as a consequence of the unexpected peremptoriness of your attitude toward me is, of course, wholly eliminated by your gracious words.

Very truly, yours,

GEORGE HARVEY.

To Col. Harvey's letter Gov. Wilson replied honestly, like the gentleman that he is. This letter is dated January 11, 1912:

HOTEL ASTOR,
New York, January 11, 1912.

MY DEAR COL. HARVEY: Generous and cordial as was your letter written in reply to my note from the University Club, it has left me uneasy, because, in its perfect frankness, it shows that I did hurt you by what I so tactlessly said at the Knickerbocker Club. I am very much ashamed of myself, for there is nothing I am more ashamed of than hurting a true friend, however unintentional the hurt may have been. I wanted very much to see you in Washington, but was absolutely captured by callers every minute I was in my rooms, and when I was not there was fulfilling public engagements. I saw you at the dinner but could not get at you, and after the dinner was surrounded and prevented from getting at you. I am in town to-day, to speak this evening, and came in early in the hope of catching you at your office.

For I owe it to you and to my own thought and feeling to tell you how grateful I am for all your generous praise and support of me (no one has described me more nearly as I would like to believe myself to be than you have); how I have admired you for the independence and unhesitating courage and individuality of your course; and how far I was from desiring that you should cease your support of me in the Weekly. You will think me very stupid—but I did not think of that as the result of my blunt answer to your question. I thought only of the means of convincing people of the real independence of the Weekly's position. You will remember that that was what we discussed. And now that I have unintentionally put you in a false and embarrassing position you heap coals of fire on my head by continuing to give out interviews favorable to my candidacy! All that I can say is that you have proved yourself very big, and that I wish I might have an early opportunity to tell you face to face how I really feel about it all. With warm regard,

Cordially and faithfully, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

This letter, written by Gov. Wilson, is such a letter as one gentleman always sends when he realizes that he has unintentionally been abrupt or brusque in conversation with another gentleman.

These letters were first published, by the mutual consent of Col. Harvey and Gov. Wilson, in the New York Evening Post under date of January 31, 1912.

UNVEILING OF STATUE OF SIMON BOLIVAR.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the notable address delivered by the minister of foreign affairs of Venezuela, Dr. Esteban Gil Borges, upon the occasion of the presentation of the statue of Simon Bolivar in the city of New York, April 19, 1921, together with the letter of Dr. L. S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan American Union, transmitting it.

Mr. MOSES. I ask the Senator from Florida if he will not be willing to have printed in the same document the President's address, delivered on the same occasion?

Mr. FLETCHER. I would be very glad to have that done. I have not a copy of it, but would be very glad to have the President's address also printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, both requests will be granted.

The addresses referred to are as follows:

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT HARDING IN NEW YORK, APRIL 19, 1921, AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF GEN. SIMON BOLIVAR.

President Harding said:

"Fellow citizens of America, there is significance in dates, as though some days were destined for a high place in the history of human progress, also an abiding place in human affections. This day is the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, when the Colonies of North America made their first sacrifice in blood for independence and new standards of freedom. On this same day, a generation later, Venezuela's struggle for freedom had its immortal beginning.

"To-day, in befitting celebration of freedom's triumphs, we are met to unveil this monument to Simon Bolivar, in whom the South American movement for liberty found its soul and inspiration, and to whom the liberty-loving heroes of Venezuela turned for triumphant leadership, just as the North American Colonies pinned their faith in Washington.

"There is further and highly interesting coincidence in dates and significance in achievement. Bolivar was born in 1783, the year in which our North American Revolutionary War was ended by the treaty which recognized our national independence; and the independence of Venezuela was formally proclaimed on July 5, 1811, on the day following the anniversary of a like proclamation by the North American Colonies 35 years earlier. April and July have valid claim to our liberty-loving reverence.

"I wish April 19 might have an added significance from this day on. Similarly born and dedicated to New World freedom, I would like this date to mark anew for North and South America not alone the avowal of mutual trust in the fellowship of freedom and democracy but a new confidence and a new mutuality of purpose in achieving the things which independence and fellowship so naturally inspire.

"Having sacrificed in arms to establish the human inheritance belonging to free men, the American Republics may well touch elbows to prove their unselfishness and show to mankind that righteous achievement does not mean anybody's destruction, individually or nationally, but that real victory lies in that human progress wherein every contender, individual or national, may share as it is sought to merit it.

"It is an interesting thing to compare the careers of the two great fathers of American liberty—these stalwart founders of representative democracy in the Western Hemisphere—Bolivar and Washington. Each wrought an empire of freedom, and builded more vastly than he dreamed. Each was brilliant and heroic in war, but vastly more concerned with the constructiveness of peace.

"Their concept of liberty was not inspired in individual unrest. Each was wealthy, each rated among the personally fortunate, but a people's freedom was impelling. Each was accused of undue ambition, but it was a people's welfare that ever inspired.

"Each knew the essentials of freedom, that liberty itself is the state of just restraint, and the fruits of revolution in the cause of freedom are garnered only in constitutional establishment and preserved only when government is strong enough to guarantee them.

"Both Bolivar and Washington were eminent in genius on the field of battle, both were rich in wisdom when it came to the more difficult problems of peace. War has its inspirations when patriotism is aflame. Peace has its problems, where construction or reconstruction must be wrought in conviction and consecration.

"Each of these national heroes, when his military tasks were finished, preferred retirement and the repose of private life. Each was promptly called to civic construction and administration through which alone the triumphs for which men sacrifice and die may be commemorated with the outstanding monuments of permanent institutions.

"It is not too much to say that out of the liberations wrought by Washington and Bolivar grew the republican constitutional system which is America's gift to mankind. Our constitutions are the models after which are fashioned the fundamental laws of a world won to democracy. Whether they looked to the north or south, or whether the beacon fire was Pan America, in the New World burned the great torch to light the way to constitutional freedom, and hope was assured by outstanding example.

"These things are said with due deference to the older civilizations and the longer-established systems from which all America came and to which we may trace back the inspiration which gave conception to the institutions of freedom to which we are dedicated. It is fine to be able to say that New World temples of liberty were not wrought in destruction of the old. We speak historically of revolution, when in reality we mean severance and freedom for evolution. The world is not calling to-day for destruction; it needs reconstruction, where the test of justice is applied to the things which were as well as the things which are to be.

"The western continents afforded a favoring soil for marvelous developments. God had bestowed with limitless bounty, nature was prodigal with her offerings. The Americas held their virgin riches, conserved against the day when science, intellect, and spiritual ambition should impel men to seek new fields for endeavors, new sites for new construction, new opportunities for new enterprises.

"Trade was calling, learning encouraged, the adventuring navigators explored, and wherever they touched they stood only at some gateway, never dreaming of the reality. We do not measure the possibilities of the Americas even now, though more than four centuries have come and gone. But the great coincidence was in discovery revealing the opportunity for planting new States and trying new methods at the very time when the human mind was opening, or reopening, to new truths, new conceptions, and new motives.

"Perhaps the miracle was in the divine plan, and the New World marvel was an inevitable part in the supreme scheme for developing civilization. But we were when Washington and Bolivar uttered American aspirations and battled for them, and are now, so interlocked with the Old World from which our founders came that independence does not make for aloofness, but the developments of civilization have brought us more closely together. Where ours has been the greater fortune, ours has become a greater responsibility, and the endurance of our institutions is no less important than their creation.

"Liberty without security would be a barren boast, and inspiration without stabilization would challenge every claim of democracy. Nothing the Americas can do, nothing Pan America may aspire to do will surpass the contribution of our youth and resources and our steadfast allegiance to our newer institutions to help steady the world and prove the right of present-day civilization to go on.

"Probably we see to-day the engrossing drama of mankind on the world stage as intimately as Gen. Bolivar saw the struggles of South America only a little more than a century ago. He could meet the problems of that day and look well to the future with such vision that a third of South America acclaims him liberator, and we join to-day to do reverence to his memory. Perhaps our greatest tribute lies in noting the world, war wearied but more free than ever before, and resolving that where liberty inspires peace and justice are the supreme fulfillment.

"The struggles for independence in North and South America had differing backgrounds. The Colonies north of the Rio Grande had developed under liberal institutions. They had enjoyed a large measure of autonomy and self-direction. Their grievances against European domination were small compared to the grievances of the South American Colonies. North American Colonies revolted against the exasperating assumption of a reactionary king; South America against the tyrannies of a vicious, despotic, perpetual, and self-perpetuating system. Where the North American Colonies were irked by minor impositions, those of the southern contingent lived under a grinding oppression that sought to extract every particle of wealth that could be taken without literally destroying the capacity to produce more.

"The South American revolution was a desperate attempt to escape at whatever cost from a state of intolerable, unlivable oppression. Union and independent greatness were possible following the northern revolt. Geographical conditions and the long-time isolation of the southern colonies from one another made it well-nigh impossible to effect union among them. It was the dream of Bolivar; but even his genius was not equal to its accomplishment. Consequently, our thirteen Colonies, when their revolt had succeeded, set themselves up, not as thirteen independent nations; but as one nation comprised of thirteen federated States. The sheer force of gravity has caused their union to expand.

"But we would make a grave mistake, I think, if we concluded too readily that our North American experience had all the advantage on its side. While we of the northern continent have been demonstrating one great truth about the democratic form of government—that through representative institutions it can be expanded successfully to include a vast imperial dominion and indefinitely increasing populations, the southern continent has been proving another equally important hypothesis. It is, namely, that a family of States, entirely sovereign and independent, may live together in the same continental area, in prosperity and progress.

"Neither continent has escaped from the misfortunes of war and revolution. We have had our contests, international and civil; but on the whole the tendency under our republican institutions has been toward establishment of those means of conciliation, arbitration, and judicial determination by which the menace of war is lessened. No American State succumbed to the temptation of that militaristic system which laid ever increasing burdens upon nations elsewhere, and which at last brought them to crisis in the Great War. In the last half century our American Commonwealths have not only been able to hold themselves aloof from competitions in armament, but they have built up a system of international arbitration and adjudication which has constantly lessened the danger of armed conflict. There is too little realization of the progress that has been made toward judicial and arbitral settlement of international differences by the American nations. It presents an example well worthy earnest consideration, and affords us an assurance which will justify our purpose to invite the present-day civilization to cast aside the staggering burden of armament.

"Much of the New World accomplishment is largely due to democratic institutions. We have not known the conflicting ambitions of dynasties. We have had little experience with secret alliances and devious diplomacies. In their very nature our democratic institutions have tended to keep us aloof from these things.

"With all humility, but in all sincerity and earnestness, I feel that we Americans, North and South, are entitled to hold that our democracy has come as a light into the world of international relations, and that it will show us a way out of the world's present troubles into a day when mankind may know peace and plenty and happiness, and when the first duty of organized society may be to promote the welfare of its members rather than to array itself in power against the threat of its destruction.

"The doctrine proclaimed under Monroe, which ever since has been jealously guarded as a fundamental of our Republic, maintained that these continents should not again be regarded as fields for the colonial enterprises of Old World powers. There have been times when the meaning of Monroeism was misunderstood by some, perverted by others, and made the subject of distorting propaganda by those who saw in it an obstacle to the realization of their own ambitions. Some have sought to make our adhesion to this doctrine a justification for prejudice against the United States. They have falsely charged that we sought to hold the nations of the Old World at arm's length, in order that we might monopolize the privilege of exploitation for ourselves. Others have protested that the doctrine would never be enforced if to enforce it should involve us in actual hostilities.

"The history of the generations since that doctrine was proclaimed has proved that we never intended it selfishly; that we had no dream of exploitation. On the other side, the history of the last decade certainly must have convinced all the world that we stand willing to fight, if necessary, to protect these continents, these sturdy young democracies, from oppression and tyranny.

"Surely, we may contemplate with some satisfaction the vindication that our American system has won. Under it, in a period so brief that history records no parallel for the achievement, we have filled two continents with splendid and prosperous States. We have maintained ourselves independent of the older systems, aloof from their differences and struggles.

We have erected in these continents a great power which, when civilization was at stake, we dared to cast into the scale on the side of right; and we have seen its weight have a deciding part in the cause of human justice.

"This much our American system has wrought by way of its own justification. Surely we may look upon our work and decide for ourselves whether it has been good. Believing it has been good, we may well decide there can be no departure from the standards that were raised for us by the founding fathers.

"If we could consult our Washington and our Bolivar to-day, and if they could advise us out of their wisdom and experience, they would tell us to go forward in firm confidence that ours is the right course. I believe they would admonish us to cling to that which has been tried, to hold fast to the institutions of moderation, of independence, of gradual but sure progress. If they, and all the other patriots who gave their blood, their genius, and their lives to establish free institutions upon this continent should be summoned to our council, they would survey what our system has accomplished for our own countries and for the world in the hour of its uttermost agony, and they would tell us that our generation had wrought into the substance of splendid achievement that which in their day was but hope's vision of a better world.

"We have created no Utopia here in the New World, and I have small hope that we shall. We have accomplished something toward betterment of mankind, toward peace, prosperity, and security; but we have yet far to travel. I bespeak mutual confidence and cooperation in dealing with these problems which are American problems, to be dealt with by us as Americans. We have gone far toward effective cooperation and we ought to go farther and record greater accomplishment.

"I know I may speak the spirit of the United States. No selfishness impels, no greed is urging, no envy incites, no hatred is actuating. There are here to-day the same aspirations as those which won enthusiasm of Simon Bolivar when he came to breathe his admirations for Washington in 1806. Washington was his inspiration, and after Gen. Bolivar had made his surpassing contribution to country and humanity, an American naval surgeon attended and consoled him in his last hour. Perhaps there is the suggestion of an indissoluble tie in his wearing at his death a medal which Washington had given Lafayette, who in turn had given it to Gen. Bolivar. The United States salutes Venezuela and the South American nations born of Gen. Bolivar's offerings on the altars of freedom, and plights its devotion to the same liberty, the same justice, the same aspirations of national independence, the same forward look, in touching elbows while we advance to greater fulfillment.

"We do not forget that in the United States to-day we have Latin American devotion to the Stars and Stripes. Porto Rico is a part of us, under a permanent policy aimed at her prosperity and progress, and we see in our Latin American State the splendid agency to help interpret the Americas to one another.

"Our thoughts are mainly of the Americas to-day. They cluster about this statue of the great Bolivar, and the good omen it brings as the gift of a nation, which utters its gratitude to him, to another nation which has ever revered him, and joins Venezuela in protecting and perpetuating the work of free men. I rejoice in this testimony of the gratitude of Venezuela, and acclaim the statue as a symbol of the deep-lying sympathy and shared regard which cements the nations of these two continents. Let it stand out as an earnest of more effective cooperation and better understanding, and more intimate and ever-assuring friendship!

"But we must also have a thought for all mankind. The world is torn and harassed, and Pan Americanism means sympathetic and generous Americanism. The world needs the utmost of production, of restoration, of rehabilitation, of steady influence, all that we can contribute to it. Our greatest service lies in standing firmly together, making ourselves strong that we may give our strength, rich that we may contribute of our riches, and confident that we may inspire others with confidence.

"The world needs, in order that its economic balance may be redressed, peace, enterprise, industry, frugality, and commercial development. Here we have two rich and mighty continents which, as a whole, have felt far less the effects of the Great War than have the older continental areas. To us the world is turning, with the plea that we draw upon the resources which nature and our common good fortune have assured to us, to aid those who have suffered more grievously than we.

"Herein lie for us both duty and opportunity; duty to those whom we may help; opportunity, in helping others, also to help ourselves. The Great War has brought to us of the Americas a new conception of our place in the world, a larger apprecia-

tion of the opportunity which is ours. We are blessed with natural wealth, with industrious populations, with every variety of soil and climate and opportunity. We have developed more nearly a realization of interdependence, a conception of something like economic, political, and spiritual solidarity, than ever before. We need to know each other better; to understand institutions and peoples and methods more accurately; to develop the great producing and commercial possibilities of our own countries; to encourage the larger exchanges of our products, the most sympathetic appreciation of our varied relations to one another and to the rest of the world. By accomplishing these things we shall mightily strengthen ourselves to carry forward our tasks of to-day and of all the to-morrows."

PAN AMERICAN UNION,
Washington, D. C., U. S. A., April 21, 1921.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am sending to you herewith the notable address delivered by the minister of foreign affairs of Venezuela, Dr. Esteban Gil Borges, upon the occasion of the presentation of the statue of Simon Bolivar to the city of New York, April 19, 1921.

Very sincerely, yours,

L. S. ROWE.

ADDRESS OF THE VENEZUELAN MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL ENVOY DR. E. GIL BORGES UPON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE EQUESTRIAN MONUMENT TO THE LIBERATOR SIMON BOLIVAR, CENTRAL PARK, NEW YORK CITY, TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1921.

Dr. Gil Borges said:

"The verdict of history, which for the memory of Bolivar began at the very moment when, at the early close of his career, he fell asleep forever and his work suffered a passing eclipse, on that mournful evening at Santa Marta, has now reached its climax, and justice has been done. This bronze monument bears witness to that fact, and this very spot would have been the one selected by him to appear before the bar of posterity. The people who have done the greatest things in the present age bestow a definite place in the hall of fame upon the man who performed the greatest deeds in the past; and his statue rising opposite the one which, at the entrance to the harbor of New York, lifts its torch on high like a never-ending dawn casting its glow over this land of the free is but a twin symbol of the ideal of the American continents.

"On this hill, wrapped in flags, there rises again the prophet of Chimborazo riding forth to future ages. Beside the Venezuelan tricolor appears the Union flag, like another wing coming to complete his dream of American confraternity; it is as if the entire sky of the American hemisphere were hovering over that bronze like a glorious mantle on which the stars of the north are brought closer—as Bolivar dreamed—to the stars of the south.

"There at the foot of this monument silence would be the only eloquent tribute; thus the bronze itself would ring like a glorious peal whose echoes have filled America's past and now from this hill are wafted from country to country over all this continent, like the mighty voice of the aspirations of liberty and justice rising to the Almighty from the hearts of men, and ringing from century to century a hymn of triumph of the Republic in the American world.

"These glories of our American past are but sacred flames where petty interests and petty differences are consumed and disappear, leaving only the light, ever brighter and more serene, that will shed its rays over the future of this New World.

"Those two symbols rising upon their two heights represent not alone our past; they are also harbingers of the future. They see with eyes accustomed to look upon infinite space; they speak in the accents of an eternal language; they point with hands long trained in creative work to the destiny of the American world by them foreseen in the far-off realms of futurity, a destiny that we see rising over us like the dawn of day to shed its light to-morrow, even as the sun, over the path of coming generations.

"The insight of men of genius, penetrating deeper than others into the soul of people, observing farther than others the path that lies before them in times to come, is often but a pre-conception of the loftiest aspirations of the spirit of a race and the deeper tendencies of their life. When such aspirations are but a mere chrysalis in the mind of the average man, in that of the man of genius they have put forth wings and have spread these in their flight to the highest summits of the future. When such tendencies are as yet merely a force that has reached in the life of the people but the uncertain and fleeting stage of a dream, in the mind of the man of genius they have attained the energy and body of a living reality.

"Bolivar is the living embodiment of such aspirations and forces—latent but not yet visible at the dawn of the last cen-

tury, except to the penetrating eye of genius—which have gradually developed and now control the life of the peoples of America. Bolivar's military idea, Bolivar's political idea, from the first to the last day of his life, was no other than the realization of the ideals of liberty and democracy as a form of government and the realization of the ideal of unity in America. From Carabobo to Ayacucho his military plans are secondary and complementary to his purposes as a statesman. Each battle is but the laurel-covered cradle of a new democracy. At Carabobo the Republic of Venezuela was born; at Boyaca, the Republic of New Granada; at Pichincha, the Republic of Ecuador; at Junin, the Republic of Bolivia; at Ayacucho, the Republic of Peru. Each new victory is a new country, a free country in America!

"But even as each one of these victories was merely a new step to fame—and from Pichincha Bolivar rises to gather the higher laurels of Junin, and from Junin rises again to gather the wreath of Ayacucho—each of these new countries was but an element in the scheme of creation he had planned, of a greater country grouping all the smaller ones under the same roof, uniting the spirit and the forces of the several countries into one great continental homeland. For the great soul of America, Bolivar could conceive of but one home as vast as a world.

"This ideal of continental solidarity is the brightest guiding star of his life. From 1815 in the famous Jamaica letter this idea grows clearer in his mind until it becomes the goal of his military and political activities. In Ayacucho his cry of victory is a song of annunciation of the greater American motherland. Ayacucho is reality rising to the heights of the dream that Bolivar's fancy created on the summit of Chimborazo. The conception of the statesman is about to close the curve drawn by the brain of the soldier, and the invitation to the Congress of Panama gives material form to his dream of an American confederation. Bolivar will ever cherish through all his disappointments that dream of his soul, and when, out of all the new countries created by him, the countryseat of San Pedro is the only home left to him, upon the ruins of those crumbling nationalities and above the flight of his soaring ideals there will always shine the light of that idea, even as a star over a Calvary, pointing to future resurrection.

"And that resurrection of ideals has been consummated. The ideal of democracy has become a reality in the Republics of the New World. The ideal of continental unity from the Congress of Panama in 1826 to the last Pan American conference in Buenos Aires in 1910 has changed in form, but it has preserved the essence of the idea of solidarity. And this very act of homage, gentlemen, is a most spontaneous and expressive demonstration of the fact that in the American soul the union of sentiments and spiritual harmony has been accomplished. Our hands clasped to offer this tribute, our hearts beating as one in this act of veneration, our admiration carried by our emotion to the heights of those heroic lives, our thoughts rising from this pedestal with a common feeling of solicitude and hope in contemplation of the future, will remain united, gentlemen, in an enduring alliance, and, triumphing over geographical conditions and historical vicissitudes, will continue to mold American character until it attains the abiding moral unity, the cooperation of effort and solidarity of interests, which will cause to arise, clear and forceful, that new civilization which, starting on this continent, must needs be the future of the world.

"Washington and Bolivar are the two noblest figures in the history of the peoples of America. They are the embodiment of common aspirations which, in quest of liberty at the dawn of the last century, materialized at the beginning of the present century in the democracies that are now enjoying, from one end of the continent to the other, the fullness of material and political development, and, extending their hands in a truly fraternal grasp, they give to the world an example of civilization based on peace, law, and justice.

"This is a fitting place for Bolivar, in the midst of a people who have in the short space of a century carried out a work of progress which represents the most stupendous effort of human energy; a fitting place for the man whose entire life was the most remarkable and brilliant example of the influence of the force of the mind and the force of the will. There was in his nature that eminent quality of constancy and unwavering faith which has carried your people to the highest place in history. Vainly did adversity strive to overpower his good fortune. Misfortune fired his spirit, which never soared higher than when rising above the tragic reverses of his life. His glory shines even brighter in the dark days of defeat than in the bright days of victory. Even greater than at Carabobo was Bolivar in 1812 when he rose in the ruins of the cities demolished by an earthquake, and the ruins of the earlier dreams

of independence, and mounting a tribune, said: 'If nature itself opposes our will, we shall fight against nature and shall conquer her.' Even greater than at Boyaca, where the liberty of Colombia was established, was he at Casacoima, when, defeated and almost a prisoner, he conceived the plan which, carried out in all its details, secured the liberty of the continent. Greater than at Junin, where he established the independence of Bolivia, greater than at Pichincha, where he established the independence of Ecuador; greater than at Ayacucho, where he established the independence of Peru, was he at Pativilca, when, at the eclipse of his fortunes, his disheartened generals asked what his plans were, and he simply replied, 'To win.' Great in prosperity, greater in misfortune, he had but one weakness—glory.

"It is fitting that he should be among you—the man who, at the zenith of his triumphal career, when a victorious army and five countries, liberated by his sword, tender him the offer of a crown, prefers to the mantle of the Caesars the simple title of citizen among his contemporaries, and the name of Liberator for coming generations.

"It is fitting that here among you should be the man who won and lost over 400 battles, rode his war horse from the mountains of Avila in Venezuela to the peaks of Ayacucho in Peru, the longest distance ever traveled by a conqueror, and then built upon the democratic system the foundations of civil life of five nations, and in Panama proclaimed arbitration as the basis of peace and international justice among the peoples of the American Continent.

"It is most fitting that he should be with you in this country, which offers its territory as a new home to all mankind, which has opened its heart to all sentiments of justice, and its mind to all ideas, transforming them into instruments of progress and happiness for man. It is well that he should be among this people that has attained all human greatness by an heroic effort of thought and action—the man who cherished for 20 years through the bitterest days of misfortune and through the greatest joys of triumph, the dream that has materialized in five Republics. This city of the future is a fitting pedestal for so great a hero, and this day will be considered in my own country and all over the American Continent as the last stage of the hero's journey to the halls of fame.

"When I have seen the greatest people on earth uncover its head and rejoice before the statue of Bolivar, and with thunderous applause greet the Liberator of South America, when the voice of your eminent President is about to set the seal of historic justice on this memorable occasion, when I think that, away to the south, on the other side of the Caribbean, my own people are raising the memory of Washington to the lofty pedestal of public admiration, it seems to me as if by the alliance of brotherly hands, which at two distant points of the world of Columbus, have erected these twin symbols of liberty on this continent—by this alliance is proclaimed the unanimity of sentiment of all the peoples, united hand and heart in the task of building the future of America.

"A woman's hand molded this statue that my country presents to the United States as a token of unending friendship. A woman's hand gave eternal form in bronze to that life that was a prodigious dream of heroism, beauty, and love. In giving to one of your women the privilege of that motherhood of glory, my country wished to enhance the significance of this token of friendship, welding together in one single piece the greatness of a heroic thought and the intellectual grace of the American woman, whose tender heart and great energy have been a priceless contribution in the building up of this home of civilization which your country is.

"Could I but adequately interpret what that immortal bronze says to the American people from the crest of this hill!

"All hail! brothers of the north," says the liberator. 'From this lofty hill, more glorious to me than the diamond-like frozen crest of Chimborazo, my soul breathes in the liberty of a world. I know how much man owes to your magnificent country. You have given the most striking example in history by founding the perfect Republic. You have given comfort in your homes to all the wanderers in quest of rights, from Kosciusko to Marti. You have placed at the service of all just causes in both hemispheres the strength of your arm and the courage of your heart. You have undone at Panama the knot that once my sword wished to cut, opening the interoceanic route beside which I dreamed of founding the capital of the world, to give a seat to the society of nations. You have raised higher than any other people in history the flag of liberty, and although strong, you have loved peace, and though great, you have loved justice. Americans of the north, Americans of the south! The time has arrived for that union which was the ideal that inspired my work, the hope that soothed my death, and the dream

that my immortal eyes have followed during a century, the realization of which will be the crowning glory of the liberators and of America's greatness.'

"In dedicating this monument my country offers not only a symbol of her historic past, but also a symbol of her national friendship as firm and staunch as that granite pedestal, as lasting as that bronze, pure and noble as Bolivar's glory, which henceforth will rise under the light of the stars that in your skies and on your flag are the beacons that guide the world toward a freer, greater, and happier future."

FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to certain existing facts, conditions which are set forth in some communications I have had from my State as to the present disastrous freight rates, and with the permission of the Senate I shall read some extracts from these letters. I do not care to have them go into the Record in toto, because they are not all pertinent to the question, but I shall read from them merely for the purpose of putting certain facts into the Record so that Senators can see just the condition in reference to our transportation.

I have a letter here from Sumter, S. C., under date of April 19, in which a large lumber dealer states that he shipped a carload of pulpwood from Lynchburg, S. C., my old home, to Sumter, S. C., a distance of 19 miles, 5 cords to the car, and the freight charge for the distance of 19 miles was \$140.

I also have a letter from another individual shipping pulpwood into Sumter from another angle, a distance of 13 miles, and the charge on the carload of pulpwood was \$90. The charge was \$140 for the 19 miles and \$90 for the 13 miles. The Bynum Lumber Co., of Sumter, is the one which writes me in reference to the 19-mile shipment.

Mr. Warren Durant, of Alcolu, S. C., is the one who wrote in reference to the Alcolu shipment.

In addition to that, I have a letter from the M. H. Lazarus Co., of King and Hasell Streets, Charleston, S. C., in the southeastern tariff division, in reference to the shipment of truck from the great trucking industry along the coast to the eastern cities, and he writes me the following, which I want to have go into the Record:

For the past year and particularly for the first four months of this year, the losses and hardships which have been incurred by the farmers of this section in marketing their products in the eastern markets have become so acute that the agricultural committee of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce feels constrained to approach our representatives in Congress with a view of securing their cooperation in bringing about a reduction in the freight rates on vegetables from the Charleston district to eastern cities.

A comparison of the rates in effect in 1914 with the rates at present in effect from the Charleston district shows the following.

I shall not quote it all, but just a few of the figures to indicate what disastrous effects these rates are having, not only upon the producers but upon consumers of these articles.

This shows the rates from Charleston to New York and Philadelphia, as follows: Cabbage in standard barrels or barrel crates—in 1914 the rate per carload lot was 46 cents; in 1921 it was 76½ cents. In less than carload lots the rate in 1914 was 48 cents, and in 1921 it was 80 cents.

On potatoes in standard barrels or in sacks the carload lot rate in 1914 was 29½ cents; in 1921 it was 49½ cents. In less than carload lots in 1914 it was 31 cents, and in 1921, 52½ cents.

For vegetables not otherwise specified, per bushel box, basket, or crate, the carload lot rate in 1914 was 30 cents, and in 1921 it was 50 cents. In less than carload lots, in 1914 it was 32 cents, and in 1921 it was 53½ cents.

Vegetables per standard barrel, or barrel crate, the carload lot rate in 1914 was 57 cents, and in 1921, 95½ cents. The less than carload lot rate in 1914 was 61 cents, and in 1921 it was \$1.02.

Mr. President, there was a meeting this morning of farmers, representing every district in the United States, calling the attention of the Chief Executive to the freight conditions which exist in this country, and he very wisely told them that the whole economic system at the present time was out of joint, and he promised to do all that was in his power to see that something might be done to relieve the situation.

The reason I am calling attention to this just at this time is because I consider the first thing essential to bring about a restoration of anything like prosperity is for us to address ourselves to this question of transportation. It is needless for me to state that with the prices of farm products far below the cost of production, with wages being reduced throughout the country, except in certain places, with everything seeking a lower level, these rates have been maintained as high as or higher than they were during the period of the war. They say that the railroads are going rapidly into the hands of receivers and

into bankruptcy, and one of the prime causes is that the rates are so high as to be prohibitory and people can not do business. It is analogous to the situation brought about by the tax on oleomargarine, which is so high that the article can not find a market, and, of course, the producers suffer.

I understand there is to be a thorough investigation of the railroad conditions by the Interstate Commerce Committee, and I wanted Senators to be informed specifically of information such as I have given them this afternoon, showing that \$90 was charged for hauling a carload of pulp wood 13 miles, and for 19 miles \$140, and a 100 per cent raise in the rate of vegetables from the semitropical and temperate zone or section of our country to the near-by eastern cities.

So that one of the prime reasons for the high cost of living is the difference between the low cost of production and the high cost of transportation which is pouring into the railroads. It is true they are carrying less, and perhaps the return is less. But as far as the shipper is concerned, it means bankruptcy for him or prohibition of his entire business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 21, 1921.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

Claudius H. Huston, of Tennessee, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Edwin F. Sweet, resigned.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

David H. Blair, of Winston-Salem, N. C., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of William Martin Williams, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Frank W. Howbert, of Denver, Colo., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Colorado, in place of Mark A. Skinner, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Arthur F. Odlin, of Florida, to be United States district judge, district of Porto Rico, vice Peter J. Hamilton, term expired.

CHIEF OF THE WEATHER BUREAU.

Charles F. Marvin, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief of the Weather Bureau of the United States Department of Agriculture. A reappointment.

REAPPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be first lieutenant with rank from April 18, 1921.

Marcus Prevost Taylor, late first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, Regular Army.

INFANTRY.

To be major with rank from April 15, 1921.

Joseph Caldwell Morrow, jr., late captain Infantry, Regular Army.

To be first lieutenant with rank from April 15, 1921.

Kameil Maertens, late first lieutenant, Infantry, Regular Army.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

INFANTRY.

Maj. Frank Blair Kobes, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

To be majors with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Archie Wright Barry, Air Service.

Capt. George Cornelius Charlton, Infantry.

Capt. Charles Harrison Corlett, Infantry.

Capt. William Korst, Quartermaster Corps.

Capt. Robert Louis Moseley, Infantry.

Capt. George Horton Steel, Quartermaster Corps.

Capt. Harry Franklin Wilson, finance department.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Clarence Ulm Snider, Medical Corps, from April 2, 1921.

First Lieut. John Bunting Haines, Medical Corps, from April 14, 1921.

First Lieut. Philip Lewis Cook, Medical Corps, from April 15, 1921.

First Lieut. George Edward Lindow, Medical Corps, from April 16, 1921.

UNITED STATES NAVY.

Capt. Ashley H. Robertson to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 8th of December, 1920.

Capt. Samuel S. Robison to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st of January, 1921.

Commander Edward H. Watson to be a captain in the Navy from the 23d of April, 1920.

Commander Ivan C. Wettengel to be a captain in the Navy from the 8th of June, 1920.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1921:

Arthur Crenshaw.

Arthur J. Hepburn.

Harry E. Yarnell.

Arthur MacArthur.

Amon Bronson, jr.

Lieut. Commander John Rodgers to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th of November, 1920.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1921:

William D. Greetham.

David M. Le Breton.

Andrew C. Pickens.

Prentiss P. Bassett.

Husband E. Kimmel.

Paul E. Dampman.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

Louis F. Thibault.

Ellis Lando.

Alfred H. Miles.

Lieut. Henry T. Markland to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of February, 1920.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1920:

George H. Emmerson.

Philip Seymour.

Lieut. David F. Ducey to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of November, 1920.

Lieut. Donald T. Hunter to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 13th day of November, 1920.

Lieut. Cary W. Magruder to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1920.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1921:

William H. Pashley.

William R. Purnell.

Kinchen L. Hill.

Thomas C. Kinkaid.

Lee P. Warren.

Charles M. James.

Harry G. Donald.

Leland Jordan, jr.

Worrall R. Carter.

Robert R. M. Emmet.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1919:

Ellsworth Davis.

William G. B. Hatch.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank Hindrelet to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1920:

John H. Buchanan.

George F. Neiley.

William A. Corn.

Philip W. Yeatman.

Robert A. Dyer, 3d.

Charles H. Mecum.

George T. Howe.

Robert S. Wyman.

William C. Burgy.

Frank P. Thomas.

Marion Y. Cohen.

John F. Moloney.

Delormier M. Steece.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Merrill T. Kinne.

Allan E. Smith.

Vincent H. Godfrey.

Homer H. Harrison.

William J. Lorenz.

Archer E. King, jr.

Donald M. Dalton.

Dewitt C. Watson.

Burton W. Chippendale.

Preston Marshall.

Robert T. Darrow.

Osborne B. Hardison.

John B. Kneip.

Conrad A. Krez.

Dallas D. Dupre.

Arthur T. Emerson.

Byron S. Dague.

Francis T. Spellman.

John H. Carson.

Carl L. Hansen.

Arthur W. Radford.

Volney O. Clark.

Jesse L. Kanworthy, jr.
 William R. Casey.
 Benjamin F. Perry.
 Scott Umsted.
 Hubert E. Paddock.
 Nelson J. Leonard.
 John D. Small.
 James P. Brown.
 Irving R. Chambers.
 Stuart A. Maher.
 Ralph Kiely.
 George C. Kriner.
 Raymond Burhen.
 John J. Mahoney.
 Albert Osenger.
 Frank W. Wead.
 Paul R. Glutting.
 Bartley G. Furey.
 Augustus J. Selman.
 Robert B. Carney.
 Edwin S. Earnhardt.
 Albert E. Schrader.
 Arnold H. Bateman.
 Henry L. Phelps.
 George P. Brewster.
 John Wilkes.
 William P. Bacon.
 Bruce P. Flood.
 Henry C. Merwin.
 James M. Steele.
 Calvin T. Durgin.
 George F. Chapline.
 Richard E. Webb.
 Thomas V. Cooper.
 Richard H. Jones.
 Carlyle Craig.
 Fred W. Connor.
 Randall E. Dees.
 Alexander D. Douglas.
 Julian L. Woodruff.
 Lisle F. Small.
 Nicholas Vytlačil.
 Robert L. Randolph, jr.
 Herbert B. Knowles.
 Joseph W. Gregory.
 Benjamin F. Staud.
 Felix B. Stump.
 Stanwix G. Mayfield, jr.
 Franklin S. Irby.
 Merrill Comstock.
 Paul U. Tevis.
 Andrew G. Reaves.
 John H. Keefe.
 John E. Reinburg.
 Adolph J. Merkt.
 Homer L. Grosskopf.
 Wilbur W. Feineman.
 Oscar W. Erickson.
 Fred D. Kirtland.
 Charles P. Cecil.
 James A. Scott.
 John D. Price.
 Edwin F. Cochrane.
 Martin B. Stonestreet.
 Cassin Young.
 James P. Compton.
 Roman J. Miller.
 Edward A. Mitchell.
 Earle E. Muschlitz.
 David C. Fox.
 Charles L. Hayden.
 Theodore M. Waldschmidt.
 Robert R. Ogg.
 John T. Metcalf.
 John J. Twomey.
 Kingsland Dunwoody.
 Frederick W. Neilson.
 Allen I. Price.
 Richard W. Gruelick.
 Ralph U. Hyde.
 Edward J. Moran.
 Francis W. Benson.
 Ford L. Wilkinson, jr.
 Leroy W. Busby, jr.
 Ralph S. Riggs.
 John M. Haines.

Earl W. Morris.
 Kenneth L. Coontz.
 Robert E. Keating.
 Allen R. McCann.
 John H. Jenkins.
 John G. M. Stone.
 Guy W. Clark.
 James P. Conover, jr.
 Peyton H. Park.
 Isidore Lehrfeld.
 Forrest P. Sherman.
 Oscar H. Holtmann.
 Frank R. Dodge.
 Vincent R. Murphy.
 Owen E. Grimm.
 Pal L. Meadows.
 Frederick S. Holmes.
 Edwin H. Price.
 Albert M. Bledsoe.
 Harold Biesemeier.
 Albert F. France, jr.
 David E. Cummins.
 John S. Phillips.
 Homer W. Clark.
 Guido F. Forster.
 Gale A. Poindexter.
 Thomas B. Hendley.
 Karl Keller.
 Philip W. Warren.
 Carl W. Brewington.
 Emile Topp.
 Edward B. Rogers.
 Thomas D. Ross.
 John V. Murphy.
 William H. Ball.
 Charles W. Weltzel.
 Kenneth M. Hoeffel.
 Ernest B. Colton.
 James Fife, jr.
 George T. Cuddihy.
 Charles W. Styer.
 Martin J. Connolly.
 Frederick L. Douthit.
 Earl E. Stone.
 Hayden H. Smith.
 Clifton E. Denny.
 Brownson P. Vosbury.
 Stanley D. Jupp.
 Robert T. Whitten.
 Henry E. Thornhill.
 Donald W. Loomis.
 Jerauld Wright.
 Harry W. Need.
 Harry D. Hoffman.
 Victor C. Barringer, jr.
 Graeme Bannerman.
 James D. Murray, jr.
 Edward W. Wunch.
 John D. H. Kane.
 Harry W. von Hasseln.
 Elmer E. Duvall, jr.
 Ernest H. Krueger.
 Watson O. Bailey.
 Edmund J. Kidder.
 Malcolm A. Deans.
 Edwin D. Gibb.
 Joseph H. Brady.
 Peyton Harrison.
 Frank B. Hillhouse.
 Ralph C. Alexander.
 Alexander C. Kidd.
 Earle W. Mills.
 Berwick B. Lanier.
 Martin R. Derr.
 Louis L. Habryl.
 Henry S. Kendall.
 William E. G. Erskine.
 Garry De Mott Custer.
 Harold E. MacLellan.
 Ralph H. Henkle.
 Edmund J. A. Murphy.
 Jack H. Duncan.
 Ford L. Wilkinson, jr.
 Leroy W. Busby, jr.
 Ralph S. Riggs.
 Gordon E. Sherwood.
 Robert R. Ferguson.

Lieut. (junior grade) Earl S. Hurlbut to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1920.

Ensign Jonathan H. Sprague to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918.

Ensign Adolph J. Merkt to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of January, 1919.

Ensign Roman J. Miller to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of December, 1919.

Ensign Stanwix G. Mayfield, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of December, 1919.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of March, 1920:

Edward A. Mitchell.	Alexander D. Douglas.
David C. Fox.	Felix B. Stump.
Charles L. Hayden.	John H. Keefe.
Kingsland Dunwoody.	Carl L. Hansen.
Homer W. Clark.	Emile Topp.
Thomas B. Hendley.	William H. Ball.
Peyton H. Park.	

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th day of June, 1920:

Forrest P. Sherman.	Donald W. Loomis.
Oscar H. Holtmann.	Jerauld Wright.
Frank R. Dodge.	Earle W. Mills.
Vincent R. Murphy.	Berwick B. Lanier.
Owen E. Grimm.	Martin R. Derr.
Pal L. Meadows.	Louis L. Habryl.
Frederick S. Holmes.	Henry S. Kendall.
Edwin H. Price.	William E. G. Erskine.
Donald A. Green.	Garry De Mott Custer.
Albert M. Bledsoe.	John D. H. Kane.
Harold Biesemeier.	Harry W. von Hasseln.
Albert F. France, jr.	Elmer E. Duvall, jr.
David E. Cummins.	Ernest H. Krueger.
J. Warren Quackenbush.	Watson O. Bailey.
John S. Phillips.	Edmund J. Kidder.
Harry W. Need.	Malcolm A. Deans.
Harry D. Hoffman.	Edwin D. Gibb.
Victor C. Barringer, jr.	Joseph H. Brady.
Graeme Bannerman.	Peyton Harrison.
Ernest A. Foote.	Frank B. Hillhouse.
James D. Murray, jr.	Ralph C. Alexander.
Edward W. Wunch.	Robert R. Ferguson.
Ernest B. Colton.	Harold E. MacLellan.
James Fife, jr.	Ralph H. Henkle.
George T. Cuddihy.	Edmund J. A. Murphy.
Charles W. Styer.	Jack H. Duncan.
Martin J. Connolly.	Ford L. Wilkinson, jr.
Frederick L. Douthit.	Leroy W. Busby, jr.
Earl E. Stone.	Ralph S. Riggs.
Hayden H. Smith.	John M. Haines.
Clifton E. Denny.	Mays L. Lewis.
Brownson P. Vosbury.	Chauncey R. Crutcher.
Stanley D. Jupp.	Gordon B. Sherwood.
Robert T. Whitten.	Alexander C. Kidd.
Henry E. Thornhill.	

The following-named acting ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Harry L. Dodson.	Ray W. Bruner.
Duane L. Taylor.	Roger F. McCall.
Louis Dreller.	

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Herbert M. Scull.	Eric M. Grimsley.
Robert F. Nelson.	John B. Griggs, jr.
Ernest E. Herrmann.	Henry C. Fengar.
Harold L. Challenger.	Harry A. Rochester.
Robert G. Waldron.	James J. Hughes.
Valentine H. Schaeffer.	Miles P. Duval, jr.
Scott G. Lamb.	Homer I. Sherritt.
Charles B. Hunt.	Ralph E. Jennings.
James D. Lowry, jr.	Fred V. Beltz.
Howard W. Fitch.	Leonard C. Parker.
Gordon M. Jackson.	Francis H. Gilmer.
Rodman D. DeKay.	George C. Dyer.
John J. Orr.	William L. Marsh.
James J. Graham.	Edwin Friedman.
William H. Ferguson.	Adrian O. Rule, jr.
Dean D. Francis.	Daniel M. McGurl.
George M. O'Rear.	Russell S. Barrett.
Peyton S. Cochran.	George F. Mentz.
John G. Crawford.	Riffel G. Rhoton.
Cyril K. Wildman.	

Ensign Earl S. Hurlbut to be a lieutenant (junior grade) from the 30th day of September, 1920.

Ensign Eliot H. Bryant to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with rank of lieutenant commander, from the 7th day of June, 1920:

Willard J. Riddick.

James A. Bass.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 30th day of July, 1919:

William H. Whitmore.

Jesse W. Allen.

Paul W. Wilson.

Ross T. McIntire.

Asst. Surg. Edward A. Brown to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 30th day of January, 1920.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 6th day of June, 1920:

John R. Middlebrooks.

Joel J. White.

Russell D. Elliott.

John Duff, jr.

Ladislaus L. Adamkiewicz.

Robert H. Snowden.

Francis E. Locy.

Maurice A. Berge.

Roger M. Choisser.

Loren W. Shaffer.

Robert P. Parsons.

Francis DeA. Gibbs.

Richard C. Satterlee.

Otis Wildman.

Benjamin G. Holton.

Wilfred M. Peberdy.

Frederick L. McDaniel.

Lyle J. Roberts.

Frederick R. Hook.

Harry S. Harding.

William T. Lineberry.

Thomas L. Morrow.

Clarence J. Brown.

Gilbert H. Mankin.

Felix P. Keaney.

John W. Vann.

Guy B. McArthur.

Bertram Groesbeck, jr.

Robert S. G. Welch.

Robert H. Collins.

Carl A. Broadbush.

William E. Beatty.

Burchard A. E. Winne.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Henry C. Johnston.

John R. Poppen.

Albert N. Champion.

Linwood H. Johnson.

Harold E. Ragle.

Fred W. Granger.

William P. Mull.

Cary D. Allen.

William W. Davies, jr.,

Roger D. Mackey.

Max Silverman.

Herbert L. Barbour.

James E. Miller.

Charles W. Rose.

Marvin M. Gould.

Norman J. Haverly.

George T. Dill.

Eustace H. Prescott.

Frederick W. Muller.

John N. Slaterry.

Frank T. Barker, a citizen, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 15th day of December, 1920.

Asst. Dental Surg. Charles C. Bockey to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 6th day of June, 1920.

Asst. Dental Surg. William A. Dorney to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1920.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 15th day of December, 1920:

George A. Campbell.

Walter I. Minowitz.

Asst. Paymaster Edward R. Eberle to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Acting Chaplain Milton H. Petzold to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 7th day of August, 1920.

The following-named naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 1st day of January, 1921:

Laurence S. Adams.

Stuart F. Smith.

William G. Du Bose.

Asst. Naval Constructor Henry E. Rossell to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 7th day of January, 1921.

Asst. Civil Engineer Robert L. McLellan, for temporary service, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 30th day of June, 1920.

Asst. Civil Engineer Henry G. Taylor to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 25th day of May, 1920.

Machinist James E. Kemmer to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 29th day of December, 1919.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons for temporary service to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Enoch G. Brian.

Reuben H. Hunt.

Harry A. Keener.

John A. Marsh.

Emil J. Stelter.

Alfred H. Ehrenclou.

Jesse D. Jewell.

Harry P. Krummes.

Victor B. Riden.

John A. Topper.

Henry C. Weber.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Samuel W. Connor.

Benjamin F. Iden.

George M. Malkin.

Andrew H. Frankel.

John C. Kenning.

Wilbert W. Munsell.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 1st day of July, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Floyd McJ. Allen.

Wilson G. Guthrie.

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons for temporary service to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Frank V. Davis.

Nicholas S. Duggan.

Roland W. Quesinberry.

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Charles P. Holland.

Henry Muenzer.

John S. George.

Leonard L. Martin.

Elmer C. O'Connell.

Asst. Dental Surg. Ray E. Farnsworth, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 1st day of July, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Chief Pharmacist Charles H. Dean, for temporary service, to be a chief pharmacist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Passed Asst. Surg. Robert F. Sledge, for temporary service, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

William H. Harrell.

Cecil G. Sutherland.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 11th day of February, 1921:

Robert M. Cachrane.

Duncan D. Bullock.

Leonard M. Desmond, a citizen, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 9th day of February, 1921.

The following-named chaplains of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be chaplains in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of November, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Patrick J. Hammersley.

Frank L. Janeway.

Hersey E. Rountree.

Bartholomew F. Huske.

Albert R. Parker.

Walter L. Steiner.

Asst. Civil Engineer Harold W. Johnson, for temporary service, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with

the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Charles L. B. Anderson.
Albert Hoar.
Dow H. Nicholson.
Harry LeG. Hilton.

Collins L. Macrae.
Albert A. L. Ort.
Robert R. Yates.

The following-named assistant civil engineers, for temporary service, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 1st day of July, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Edward D. Graffin.
William W. Schneider.

Asst. Civil Engineer Thomas J. Brady, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 1st day of July, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

The following-named citizens to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 29th day of January, 1921:

Floyd C. Bedell.
William O. Hiltabidle, jr.
Cushing Phillips.
Harry W. Kenney.

Henry E. Wilson.
William D. Chandler.
George R. Brooks.
Alexander Martin, jr.

The following-named chief pharmacists, for temporary service, to be chief pharmacists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Lester E. Bote.
Datus M. Hervey.
Robert Martin.

Thomas C. Hart.
Walter C. Magoon.
Walter Zur-Linden.

The following-named lieutenants, for temporary service, to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920, to correct the date from which they take rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

William B. Stork.
Anthony McHugh.
Alexander Stuart.

Lieut. August Rettig, for temporary service, to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 1st day of July, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920, to correct the date from which they take rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Jerome Braun.
David B. Peters.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21, 1921.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES NAVY.

Capt. Julian L. Latimer to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of four years.

PAYMASTER GENERAL AND CHIEF OF BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS, UNITED STATES NAVY.

Pay Director David Potter to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of four years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 21, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, Thou art our refuge and strength. Again have we eaten at Thy table and rested within the curtains of Thy darkness. Therefore, we bring unto Thee offerings of gratitude. Qualify us in those virtues that make for personal rectitude and stability of government, and give unto us the blessings of a mind that sees and a heart that feels. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POSTAL COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints to fill the vacancy in the Joint Commission on Postal Service the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. ROUSE.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4075, to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4075, with Mr. STAFFORD in the chair. The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening the first section of the bill had been read for amendment. No opportunity was afforded before adjournment for amendment. It is open for amendment at this time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, on page 1, line 6, the word "Isthmian."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN: Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "Isthmian."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it perhaps is not important whether the word "Isthmian" is stricken out or left in. I believe it is in the existing immigration law or some part of it. Yet Congress by the act of August 24, 1912, provided that the Isthmian Canal Zone should be known and designated as "The Canal Zone." I think it is a little better to call Illinois, Illinois; New York, New York; and the Canal Zone, the Canal Zone, language which has been provided by a congressional act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910. This provision shall not apply to the following, and they shall not be counted in reckoning any of the percentage limits provided in this act: (1) Government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees; (2) aliens residing in the United States who return from a temporary visit abroad; (3) aliens in continuous transit through the United States; (4) aliens lawfully admitted to the United States who later go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory; (5) aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure; (6) aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration; (7) aliens from the so-called Asiatic barred zone, as described in section 3 of the immigration act; (8) aliens who have resided continuously for at least one year immediately preceding the time of their admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central or South America, or adjacent islands; or (9) aliens entitled to readmission to the United States under the provisions of the joint resolution entitled, "Joint resolution authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or cobelligerent forces," approved October 19, 1918.

(b) For the purposes of this act nationality shall be determined by country of birth, treating as separate countries the colonies or dependencies for which separate enumeration was made in the United States census of 1910.

(c) The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, jointly, shall, as soon as feasible after the passage of this act, prepare a statement showing the number of persons of the various nationalities resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910, which statement shall be the population basis for the purposes of this act. In case of changes in political boundaries in foreign countries occurring subsequent to 1910 and resulting (1) in the creation of new countries, the Governments of which are recognized by the United States, or (2) in the transfer of territory from one country to another, such transfer being recognized by the United States, such officials, jointly, shall estimate the number of persons resident in the United States in 1910 who were born within the area included in such new countries or in such territory so transferred, and revise the population basis as to each country involved in such change of political boundary. For the purposes of such revision and for the purposes of this act generally aliens born in the area included in any such new country shall be considered as having been born in such country, and aliens born in any territory so transferred shall be considered as having been born in the country to which such territory was transferred.

(d) When the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year under this act shall have been admitted all other aliens of such nationality, except as otherwise provided in this act, who may apply for admission during the same fiscal year shall be excluded: *Provided*, That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any month shall not exceed 20 per cent of the total number of aliens of such nationality who are admissible in that fiscal year: *Provided further*, That aliens who are professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, nurses, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, aliens belonging to any recognized learned profession, or aliens employed as domestic servants, may if otherwise admissible be admitted notwithstanding the maximum number of aliens of the same nationality ad-

missible in the same month or fiscal year, as the case may be, shall have entered the United States; but aliens of the classes included in this proviso who enter the United States before such maximum number shall have entered shall (unless visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure) be counted in reckoning the percentage limits provided in this act: *Provided further*, That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given so far as possible to the parents and minor children of citizens of the United States, and to the parents, wives, and minor children of aliens who are now in the United States and have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have a committee amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the first committee amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. There are several paragraphs in the section which has been read. Suppose amendments are offered to paragraphs (c) or (d), will it then be permissible for a Member to offer an amendment to paragraph (a) or (b) notwithstanding amendments have already been accepted to later provisions of the section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no control over the order in which amendments may be offered to the various paragraphs in the section. As the gentleman well knows, the Committee of the Whole will first consider the committee amendments, and amendments to those amendments are in order. If no amendments to those are made, they will be voted on forthwith, and then any Member, preference, of course, being given to members of the committee, will be recognized to offer amendments to any or all of the paragraphs of the section.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a statement with reference to the committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 14, after the word "Islands," strike out the word "or."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment just reported by the Clerk on line 14, page 3, be considered in connection with the committee amendment which begins on line 20 of the same page, running for the rest of that page and into the next page. If the committee amendment beginning on line 20, page 3, to which I have just referred, is agreed to, it is then necessary to adopt the amendment which the Clerk has reported on line 14 of page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the first committee amendment be considered in connection with the second committee amendment as found on page 3, beginning with line 21, continuing the rest of the page, and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 4. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 20, after the figures "1918," insert a semicolon and the following language: "or aliens who prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or of the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence, whether such persecution is evidenced by overt acts or by laws or governmental regulations that discriminate against the alien or the race to which he belongs because of his religious faith."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfect amendment which I offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 3, line 23, after the words "United States" insert the word "solely."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in regard to this that if the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union decides to retain in the bill the committee amendment to be found in the italics at the bottom of page 3, it should be perfected, according to my judgment, by adding the word "solely," so that it would read:

Aliens who prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or of the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States solely to avoid religious persecution—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment, which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois as a member of the committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: Page 4, line 3, after the word "faith," insert: "Aliens fugitive or refugee for political reasons, which facts may be established by the verdict of a jury on an issue framed in a habeas corpus proceeding in the district court of the United States where such alien may be sojourning."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the committee amendment.

Mr. SABATH. In what way is it not germane?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We have here a committee amendment, which it is proposed to amend by adding an entirely new classification.

Mr. SABATH. We have many classifications and many exemptions, and this is additional to those already in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I take it, whether the committee amendment be left in or taken out, the amendment offered by the gentleman would then be in order as a new proposition to be offered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SABATH. This is to perfect a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] offers an amendment which seeks to add a different class to that of the committee amendment, namely, to fugitives or refugees for political reasons. The amendment under consideration excepts only those from the computation who seek admission to this country to avoid religious persecution. This is adding a new class apart and distinct to that in the amendment under consideration and accordingly is out of order. The Chair will say that he will recognize the gentleman to offer his amendment as a new subdivision. The point of order made by the gentleman from Washington is sustained.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUSTED: After line 22, page 3, strike out the rest of subdivision (a) and insert the following: "Actual subjects of religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence and are seeking admission to the United States to avoid the suffering and hardship involved in such persecution."

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill, relying upon the judgment of the men who have framed it, although I have my own doubts as to its necessity or wisdom. I think we are getting along pretty well under existing law and regulations. I believe the fear is not well founded that grave dangers are involved in permitting immigration from Europe as restricted by existing statutes. There is this to be said for the bill, however, as a temporary measure. I think it is probably true that such immigration as is coming here is not of a very desirable class from an economic standpoint. The real workers, the men who would be economically useful, are remaining in their own countries assisting in their upbuilding and recuperation from the devastation of the war, and those who are coming here are the parents and the dependent children and the female relatives of people who are already in this country. I think it is our duty to receive a certain number of these people, particularly the dependent parents and the dependent minor children, but I see no reason, however, why we should open the gates and admit all of the other relatives of people who are in this country, and for that reason I am going to vote for the legislation. I do think that this exception in No. 10 should be amended. As the exemption reads now you can drive a four-horse chariot through it. It would only be necessary to prove that there is a discriminatory statute upon the books of some country, even though that statute has never been executed against anybody, to entitle everybody who would come within that discrimination to admission to this country, and they would not come within the enumeration carried in the bill. I believe further, although I am not quite sure about it, that, under the provisions of this amendment, any persons seeking admission to this country would be entitled to come in, on proof that he had reason to believe he would be discriminated against, or that he would be persecuted, even if as matter of fact he never had been. It has been the traditional policy of the United States to give asylum here to all who are the victims of religious persecution, and I am heartily in favor of continuing that policy. Our ancestors came here for that very reason, and we should not shut the door to people who are suffering from religious persecution in any land, but I do not believe we should make it possible through a technical point in the law to admit a very large class of people from any country on the ground that there is some discriminatory statute which might be executed against them, or that persecution might be apprehended even though it never had existed and might never occur.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Let me say that the language in question has been in the immigration law since 1917, and that the Department of Labor informed me yesterday that in the period of 18 months just 14 cases were allowed to enter under that provision. During that time the immigrant who arrived has been required to establish these facts to the satisfaction of the Assistant Secretary of Labor. There have been cases on appeal which have come up, and the Assistant Secretary of Labor has not ruled allowing some of these immigrant girls to come into the United States when that plea was made, and the commissioner at Ellis Island knows that some of these girls who were returned committed suicide on the ships which were taking them back on account of rulings which were made in respect to their coming over here. One of those girls was a Rumanian girl who came over from the other side. No matter what our law may be upon this particular subject, it is the administrative officers who will have to determine what its meaning is. They decided in the four years of time it has been upon the statute books that it only applied to 14 cases.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Can the gentleman state if there is any estimate of the number of applications which were not granted?

Mr. SIEGEL. I know that the commissioner has told me that there were a number of cases which went up, and I know that I purposely telephoned the other day, in fact, yesterday morning, to Mr. Hampton to ascertain definitely how many had been allowed in. He told me there were 14 that had come in during the 18 months of time in which the question had come up. I have relied, and I do rely, upon what Commissioner Wallis told me about these cases.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HUSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He is a very able lawyer, and I would like to ask him if it would not be mandatory upon the immigration officials to admit to this country all persons seeking admission if they established the fact that they came within the provisions of a discriminatory regulation or statute based upon religious opinion, even though that statute had never been executed against them, even though they never, as a matter of fact, suffered any persecution or oppression on account of religion?

Mr. SIEGEL. My answer to that is, no. You must establish the fact that you were actually persecuted, and that has been the ruling of the department up to this hour.

Mr. HUSTED. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the language of the amendment. The language says "whether it is evidenced by any overt act or by the existence of a discriminatory statute."

Mr. SIEGEL. That would mean, namely, that if they made a regulation over there that if a person could not worship according to his own conscientious belief, and that he had suffered hardships as a result of overt acts, then he would not come within the statute.

Mr. HUSTED. But I want to call the gentleman's attention to this point: It says here they must be excluded if such persecution is evidenced by overt act or by laws or government regulations that discriminate against the alien. In other words, there are two distinct classes of cases, one where the persecution follows an overt act. I am heartily in favor of admitting them wherever the persecution is evidenced by overt acts, whether those overt acts consist in actual persecution by the people or by the execution of a discriminatory law. It makes no difference to me whether the persecution is by the people or by the Government. But you have two distinct classes of cases here, one class of cases evidenced by overt act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes further.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUSTED. And the other class of cases is where the persecution is evidenced by the existence of a regulation or a statute, whether the statute is executed or not. If it is on the books it is sufficient, within the language of the amendment, to require the immigration officials to grant admission.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to say to my colleague that I can not agree with him upon that, because the rulings of the department have been to the contrary. I have read the evidence in a number of cases and they are tied to establish facts. Many times I differed with the department after reading the testimony, and yet the department ruled the other way. In

other words, the department says that where one has come to America to escape persecution, and where a girl said that she expected to be able to get along better in this country, that she had come here for two reasons—to escape persecution and in order to relieve her conditions—they ordered her back. The department is administering this law and not we. If the department had administered this law in the light in which we had enacted it, then perhaps 150 or 200 cases would have come in.

I want to say this to my able colleague. This is to provide for a year's time. Before I get through here to-day I expect to offer an amendment to this bill to provide that the Secretary of State shall conduct an investigation and report to us in regard to a number of these matters within a very short period of time. The reason why I have selected the Secretary of State is this: The Secretary finds himself in an anomalous situation on account of what has occurred during the past 48 hours, for which he was not responsible. I have sufficient faith in the Secretary of State that he will conduct the investigation impartially, so that we will obtain the true facts as to the conditions on the other side.

Mr. HUSTED. My amendment was simply in the interest of proper, scientific legislation. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not admit that under the language of his amendment the mere existence of a discriminatory governmental regulation or statute is the overt act?

Mr. SIEGEL. I will say this, that the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the Secretary of Labor is the sole judge in all of these matters, and there is no appeal from his decision.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Is not that the same language that is in the law now?

Mr. SIEGEL. It is.

Mr. SABATH. It is in the immigration act.

Mr. SIEGEL. I will say that I and other Members compared that language. Judge Burnett gave it quite some study—and we all admit that he was quite an authority, if not the ablest authority this Congress has ever had in all its history, on the matter of immigration—and he decided on that language.

Mr. LONDON. Does not the mere existence of a governmental restriction indicate a sanction by the highest authorities in the country of discrimination because of race and faith?

Mr. SIEGEL. If there is any regulation by statute that of itself might be determined the best evidence. Our Department of Labor has determined the instances in which the individual has suffered.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VAILE. I think it would clear the mind of the committee a little as to the matter of this small number who, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] says, have taken advantage of this provision in the existing law, if we show what the existing law is. Now, the existing law, which is the immigration act of 1917, provides that all aliens over 17 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language or some other language or dialect, shall be excluded.

Now, then, it goes on to say—

That the following classes shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, namely: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence—

Followed by the language quoted in this committee amendment.

The point of this, Mr. Chairman, is that the people who might be actually suffering from persecution would be admitted in any number under the existing laws if they were literates. The reason that any number have not applied for admission under that provision is because they have also had to get past the illiteracy test. The reason why only a small number have applied under that provision is probably because of the fact that only a small number needed to pass the illiteracy test. There may be a good many people, there may be possibly 40,000 people, who would not want to be counted in making up this 3 per cent, or whose friends would not want them to be counted in making up this 3 per cent, and those people would have an object now in claiming religious persecution when they did not have it under existing law. In other words, after the passage of this bill there might be a great many more than the small number mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr.

STEIGER] who would apply. The fact that only a small number have applied thus far by no means proves that a large number might not apply in the immediate future, because the only reason why only a small number has applied heretofore is because only a small number needed to apply under that provision. There might have been 50,000 who wanted to come here, but there was only a small number who wanted exemption on this ground because there was only a small number who were not literate.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time on this amendment has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment would be an amendment in the third degree, and therefore would not be in order at this time.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED] to the amendment is under discussion at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment and the amendment thereto are under discussion.

Mr. RAKER. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress heretofore has enacted the provision enumerated in subdivision 10, and that it has worked satisfactorily, and that there is no necessity or reason for a change at this time.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Would it not be more correct to say that conditions for its operation have not yet arisen?

Mr. RAKER. No. I want to say that from information which the Committee on Immigration has received for the last two years, it seems that if there is any chance for it to work it might be in the future, to my mind; but, as a matter of fact, if you get the testimony of those who have been in foreign countries who have testified in regard to religious persecution, you will find there is practically no persecution on account of religious faith. But in order to avoid any complication and give those an opportunity, if perchance there was such persecution, they would be given the opportunity to come to this country, according to the construction of the provision as it now reads. The mere fact that there is a rule or law or regulation against a particular faith does not permit him to come to this country under this provision, but he must show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that he individually is being persecuted by that law or is being persecuted by the overt act. The mere fact that there is a law on the statute books or a rule or regulation does not affect him. When he is not injured it gives him no reason for complaint, and he can not invoke it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The gentleman has no doubt observed in the newspapers reports of pogroms or persecutions in the Ukraine and in Rumania and other eastern countries of the Jewish people there. Now, are these reports true?

Mr. RAKER. I think from all that I can gather from the testimony, so far as the pogrom is concerned relative to religious faith, it is not because of the mere fact that a man belongs to the Greek Catholic Church or to the Roman Catholic Church or to the Protestant Church or the mere fact that he believes in the Jewish religion. There is none of that going on, because it was demonstrated to us last night by a man who was in Russia and who had been in prison there for four years that the present soviet government is being controlled, 75 per cent of it, by Jewish people; but they have forgotten the Jewish faith. Therefore they are working as Jews or as Greeks or as Russians, but the question of the faith of those people as members of the Jewish Church or of the Greek Church has nothing to do with it. It is simply a case of a man getting into power and forgetting his religious faith.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. When the gentleman said that the gentleman he referred to had been in prison for four years he meant he had been in prison for four months?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I meant to say four months.

Mr. SABATH. That gentleman did not describe conditions in Armenia and Rumania, but in Russia?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; in Russia. All that has been said about the soviet government seems to have been confirmed by the experience of gentlemen visiting that country, from the highest official to the lowest.

Mr. PERLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to my colleague from New York [Mr. HUSTED], who has an amendment to the committee amendment, that the Secretary of Labor will determine what aliens should be admitted because of religious persecution. Under the committee amendment the alien must satisfy the immigration officer or the Secretary of Labor that he is seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution. I go further, and say to him that I do believe that in Poland there was and is religious persecution and discrimination against the Jews. Among other ideals, this Government was founded on the theory of freedom of religious belief, and if we do nothing more by the adoption of the committee amendment than to serve notice on all foreign Governments that we are against persecution or discrimination against anyone because of religious belief we will have accomplished a great deal for humanity.

Let me say to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] that Mr. Schwartz did not tell us last night that 75 per cent of those in control of the government in Russia were Jews, but he did say that those in control of the present Russian Government have no religious faith or belief, and that not one-half of 1 per cent of the Jewish people in Russia favor bolshevism or communism.

Mr. RAKER. He said that 75 per cent of those who were in control were Jewish people, and that only about 600,000 people in Russia controlled all the other millions.

Mr. PERLMAN. No. He said that about 75 per cent of the officials of Russia were previously of Jewish faith, but that not one-half of 1 per cent of Russian Jews are in favor of bolshevism. I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED] and am heartily in favor of the committee amendment, to exempt from this law all those against whom there is by law or regulation any discrimination because of religious faith or belief.

Mr. LONDON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. LONDON. To ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I desire first of all to enter my protest against Members of Congress repeating prejudicial and highly colored statements coming from adherents of the czar and intended to prejudice the American people against the aspirations of the Russian democracy.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONDON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. I was simply repeating what was given to us last night as Members of the Congress by a gentleman who was introduced by my colleague from California [Mr. KAHN] as a first-class gentleman who could present facts of which he had first-hand information.

Mr. LONDON. He may be a first-class gentleman, but if I am not mistaken he is a former Cossack officer who probably seeks the restoration of czarism in Russia, and he should be the last person to be accepted as an authority by Members of the American Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did it ever occur to the gentleman from New York that he might discuss the merits of this amendment without discussing what was said last night?

Mr. LONDON. This talk about the people of a particular faith controlling a government which is at present unpopular is bigotry, stupidity, and absolutely inexcusable in any parliament of a free people. Just now the government of Russia happens to be unpopular. Of course, adherents of the old régime will insist that 75 per cent of its government are of the faith whose followers have suffered most from czarism.

I have no patience with the stories that are being told about Russia. There seems to be somewhere in operation a factory for the manufacture of falsehoods about Russia and quite some

machinery for their wholesale and retail distribution. We get very little of the truth about international affairs, and while the manufacture of gas for war purposes has stopped, the manufacture of gas for poisoning the human mind is more active than ever before. Now, why not be plain about this proposition? Europe is upset. All hatreds have been fanned into flames, all animosities have been intensified by five years of fighting. Entire populations have been transferred and new allegiances have been forced upon them.

In some sections where various religious sects are now compelled to live together, although in the past they belonged to separate governments, in those cases national hostility has also taken the form of religious conflict. These groups, although frequently of the same race, hate each other most heartily. Armenians are very often Mohammedans or Roman Catholics or Greek Catholics or Protestants, and wherever their numbers are small they are likely to be persecuted and oppressed. The Jewish people, the martyred people of history, a small group, a minority everywhere, who are trying to live their spiritual lives in their own way, have been and still are the victims of religious persecution in many lands. We have the twentieth century by the calendar, but the calendar is the worst of all liars. In many sections and places we are still in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. We have the bigotry and obscurantism of medieval days in many a place. There is one truth that has given vitality to America, and that is that any form of discrimination because of religion is abhorrent in the sight of Americans.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I will.

Mr. HUSTED. America has lived the proclamation of that truth for 145 years. Does the gentleman think it is desirable to place in the statute a discrimination which is unnecessary and which might be abused to let in a large number of people in discrimination against the people of every other creed and race, when those people are actually not subjects of any persecution whatever? To the extent to which they are the subject of persecution I am heartily in favor of admitting them, and I believe every good American is, but I do not believe that the bill should be discriminatory in favor of anybody.

Mr. LONDON. My argument is that no civilized government should permit on its statute books any law or regulation which would discriminate against any group of people because of their faith and of their race, and the very existence of such a regulation is positive and convincing proof that there is a state of facts which will result in discrimination.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I know the gentleman is well informed about these things. Is there to-day on the statute book of any country of Europe any discriminatory regulation or law against the Jewish people?

Mr. LONDON. I understand that most governments have eliminated such regulations; but we are dealing with a state of facts, which is that with the present abnormal conditions in Europe there are many minorities who suffer discrimination solely because they are minorities.

May I ask an extension of five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Will the gentleman permit me a half a minute?

Mr. LONDON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. I have a speech that I made on the Jews of Rumania and the treaty of Berlin, in which I gave 24 occasions of statutory discrimination against the Jews of Rumania and those in the face of article 44 of the treaty of Berlin, by which the Rumanian Government agreed to guarantee the civil and political liberty of all inhabitants, including the Jews, and this is still in force.

Mr. LONDON. The point I desire to call attention to is this: In every country of the world minorities suffer most when things are unbalanced, and that is the condition in many countries of Europe to-day.

The state of civilization of a country can be measured by the degree of tolerance, the degree of kindness, with which the

minority is treated. When things are upset the mob strikes at the minority, the minority is blamed for all the ills of society. With the world in confusion, it is the minority, whether it be religious, racial, or social, that is always the victim. Please do not propose anything that will weaken the effect of the provision calculated to protect religious dissentients.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Will not the gentleman admit that if we are to take the minorities in here that we had better not have any restrictive immigration bill at all?

Mr. LONDON. America has been built up by immigration. Every immigrant that comes to our shores is both a producer and a consumer. Other countries go to war to acquire more territory and larger populations. We can easily absorb an additional hundred million men. I do not look on immigration as an evil. Nor am I afraid of the incoming of dangerous ideas, because under free discussion wrong ideas can always be corrected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, your attention has been called to the fact that the words offered as a committee amendment are in the language of one of the exemptions in the literacy test law. That is to say, a person proving this with regard to religious persecution may be admitted even though illiterate. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED] has offered a partial substitute which I shall read to you. I see no reason why the committee's amendment should not be perfected, and I see no reason why the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED] will not serve the purpose of the original amendment without being subject to the objections that are being made by some Members of the House. The Husted amendment is as follows:

Actual subjects of religious persecution in a country of their last permanent residence who are seeking admission to the United States to avoid the sufferings and hardships involved in such persecution.

I have inquired as to the practices of the department in handling the persecution cases. First, if in some town or city over there, whether there is a police regulation or not, the people are run out by what appears to be a mob which opposes their religion; then these people who are run out are persecuted, and if they are able to show that to the satisfaction of our authorities, they are admitted.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Did the gentleman hear what the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER] said?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The proof of one of these regulations would be ample.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I understand, but it is necessary to carry all that in this act. I am quite willing that the amendment shall be so perfected as to hold the United States open as an asylum for all persons really persecuted for their religious beliefs, but real persecution should be shown.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Suppose there is a law in a European State which absolutely prohibits a Jew or a Catholic from worship. Does the gentleman say that a man or a woman proposing to come to this country must show that they have obeyed that law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I think he might undertake to show that, but I think there should be shown actual persecution. If in any one of these countries one neighbor quarrels with his neighbor on a religious subject, that is not held as a persecution. One man might spit in the other's face on account of their religious differences, and still it might be a quarrel and not persecution.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This committee amendment uses language that I think ought to be retained rather than to substitute the language proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED]. That says—

whether such persecution is evidenced by overt acts or by laws that discriminate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I wish the gentleman would secure some time of his own, as I have only five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But the gentleman's time will be extended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire this amendment to be discussed carefully and fully. I think this: A country over there might have a regulation in regard to several races or creeds, and that regulation might have been a dead letter for 15 years, but still it is a regulation or law. Why should we be obliged to recognize it and decide that it constitutes religious persecution?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is an old saying which is very true, that a man has lost his liberty not only when he is in prison but also whenever he may, in accordance with a law which violates his rights, be imprisoned by a tyrant. If a law is on the books which absolutely prohibits a man from worshipping because he is a Catholic or because he is a Presbyterian or a Jew, that man is deprived of his liberty. He may be too poor to protest. Yet his liberties are infringed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, well, there are people in the United States to-day who are contending that their liberties are infringed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield to me, in order that I may make a suggestion to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. HUSTED. I call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the fact that the slightest attempt by a Government to execute such a law as that to which he refers would be the overt act itself, within the strict language of my amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But I claim that helpless people in any country should not be compelled to commit what is called an overt act against a law prohibiting freedom of religious worship, and subject themselves to imprisonment before they can come here. In my judgment it would be wrong to strike out from the committee amendment the language which I read a moment ago. Under the treaty of 1832 which we had with the Czar's Government, that Government used to exclude American citizens simply because they were Jews, and also, we heard on good authority, because, in some instances, they were Catholics. I am not a Catholic, but that was the fact. Evarts protested against it and Blaine protested against it, but without avail. Finally during the Taft administration the House Committee on Foreign Affairs passed a bill to abrogate that treaty, and the executive department, under the leadership of President Taft, did abrogate it. Russia refused to negotiate a new treaty because we had said that an American citizen should not be excluded from any country in the world upon the ground of his religious faith.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And on top of that the then Russian Government found a way to deny admission to American travelers.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But we did not recognize the conduct of the Russian Government by submitting any longer to the injustice to our citizens. If a monarchical form of Government should ever resume authority in Russia, if the friends of the Czar should ever again get control in Russia, the same religious tyranny would be exercised.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me remind the gentleman and the House, while we are considering this proposition with respect to religious persecution, that you are likely to be called upon in a few minutes to consider an amendment concerning the matter of political persecution.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to say to my colleague [Mr. HUSTED] that all immigration coming to this country is to-day controlled by the State Department. That department determines exclusively the number of immigrants permitted to come from each particular country to the United States. The Labor Department has nothing to do with it. The State Department will be the one in reality to determine how many visés are to be granted from any particular country under this 3 per cent provision. The visé law is being strictly enforced. Therefore, the committee amendment is the one which should remain in the law, because it follows that which is the law to-day and which has been construed by the Department of Labor and by the State Department. If this bill ever does become law, for only one year and no longer, that during that period of time we may have perhaps 15 or 20 or 30 or 40 cases above the 3 per cent which might appeal to the consul on the other side to be such as should receive a visé.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. I admit that I realize the State Department largely controls immigration through the exercise of the visé authority, but I do not admit and I do not think it follows that because a provision happens to be in the immigration law at the present time it should necessarily be carried into the new legislation we are now enacting, because if it is not scientific, if it is not right, it should be changed and perfected in this legislation.

Mr. SIEGEL. Then my colleague should vote against the entire bill, because it is not scientific, is inhuman and unfair, and every leading newspaper throughout the country printed last evening and this morning so states.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the committee amendment.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment to the committee amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the Husted amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUSTED) there were—ayes 78, noes 34.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to perfect the committee amendment as now amended, in the manner I perfected it originally, by the addition of the word "solely" after the words "United States."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, that has already been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that has been adopted. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment as amended again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Or aliens who prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or of the Secretary of Labor that they are actually subjects of religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence and are seeking admission to the United States to avoid the suffering and hardship involved in such persecution.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk omitted the word "solely" in the reading of that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment with the correction suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, which was an amendment adopted without objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 20, after the figures "1918," insert a colon and the following language: "Or (10) aliens who prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or of the Secretary of Labor that they are actual subjects of religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence and are seeking admission to the United States solely to avoid the suffering and hardship involved in such persecution."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs the pardon of the committee. The Chair desires to inform the committee that he was under a misapprehension, that while the word "solely" was offered by the gentleman from Washington in line 23 and was adopted, yet it was part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which was to strike out and insert, and therefore is not included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire to insert after the words "United States," in the amendment adopted, the word "solely."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Have we not just adopted that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. STEVENSON. I understood the gentleman was offering an amendment to the amendment which we had already adopted, and it seems to me the time to propose an amendment to an amendment was before the amendment was adopted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am under the impression the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington comes in simply ahead of the amendment which has been already adopted and does not come in the language of the amendment already adopted. I think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, which was agreed to, was to strike out language after the words "United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The language after line 22 to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Then, of course, this amendment is not in order, but the gentleman can offer a substitute for the whole thing, including the word "solely."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from South Carolina is well taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer as a substitute to the amendment just adopted the following.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers a substitute to the committee amendment as amended, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 20, after the figures "1918," insert a colon and the following language: "or (10) aliens who prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or the Secretary of Labor that they are actually subjects of religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence and are seeking admission to the United States solely to avoid the suffering and hardship involved in such persecution."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now reverts on the amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The next vote is on the next committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the Chairman please, it will be necessary now to adopt the amendment striking out the word "or" in line 14.

The CHAIRMAN. That has already been adopted. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 24, after the word "unless" in the parentheses, strike out "visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure" and insert "excluded by subdivision (a) from being counted."

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, page 6, line 1, the last word, "counted." I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio in favor of the amendment without the pro forma amendment offered by him.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, this bill is one of the most important that will come up before the Congress this year. It is of vital importance, and, in my opinion, it is the duty of the Members of this House to consider the rights of the citizens of the United States first. Speaking as a new Member, coming directly from the people, and as a member of the Committee on Immigration, I urge its adoption. Only last week this House by almost a unanimous vote passed a bill for the protection of American farmers and factories. This temporary immigration bill, the object of which is to protect American citizens, should also have the unanimous support, particularly of the new Members. The United States has passed the point of assimilation. Between the years 1908 and 1914, 6,690,000 aliens came into this country, and during that same period of time certificates of naturalization were only issued to 417,973 aliens in this country. In other words, for every 16 unnaturalized aliens coming to this country during the six-year period of time only 1 became a naturalized citizen.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. I have not the time.

Mr. SIEGEL. I will get the gentleman's time extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CABLE. At the present time there are 1,256,860 naturalized aliens in the United States, and at the same time there are more than 10,000,000 unnaturalized aliens within our borders. In other words, for every eight unnaturalized aliens there is only one naturalized alien within our borders at this time.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. I am sorry I have not the time. The second reason for the passage of this bill is the fact that we have no housing facilities for any further immigration. The housing experts tell us that there is needed from one to three and a half million new homes in our country. In the year 1920 there were 1,000,000 marriages and at the same time only 75,000 homes were built. We have no homes for these new people seeking to come to this country. Before the war 350,000 new homes were constructed each year. The housing question has become a national problem, especially in the large cities. The third proposition, and the most important for the consideration of the House as to why we should adopt this bill, is because there are between four and five million men and women out of work.

Unemployment constitutes one of the most pressing problems of our country. Thirty-six and nine-tenths per cent of those working in January, 1920, were out of work at the end of the year.

Our Government in its report advises us—and this condition certainly is alarming—that in February, 1921, there were 1 per cent more people out of work than in January; in March, 1921, there was an additional increase of 1½ per cent over that of February. In Ohio alone, 50 per cent of those who were working in January, 1920, were out of work in January, 1921. Between 1820 and 1920 more than 33,000,000 immigrants came to this country. For a period of nine years prior to the war they came at a rate of a million a year, and the estimated number for the fiscal year of June 30, 1921, is 750,000. As this number increases so will the number of unemployed with its harmful results. Because we have no homes for those who are seeking to come to our shores, because we have passed the point of assimilation, and for the protection of the American citizen, and particularly those out of work, I urge that the new Members of this House support the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. SIEGEL, Mr. VOLK, and Mr. WARD of North Carolina rose.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina desires recognition in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SIEGEL. I did not know that any amendment was offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was recognized and spoke in favor of the committee amendment. The Chair will now recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARD] in opposition to the amendment, unless there is some member of the committee who wishes to speak.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, that this bill is unsound in economics, unsubstantial and delusive in its political forecast, and un-American in the whole warp and woof of its construction is to me as certain as that I live to-day. Recognizing the patriotism of its promoters here as equal to my own, I have substantial cause to fear that it originated in the worst feature of the spirit of modern labor unionism, which seeks to stifle every breath of legitimate competition necessary to the freedom, the health, and vitality of the American economic life. It prescribes an unconditional and arbitrary limitation upon immigration to this country, and that within most narrow limits, from any and all the countries of the British Empire and continental Europe, notwithstanding it was from many of them that came the sterling stock of original settlers that sought our shores to escape the tyranny of their native land in those not far-distant days when the fires of political liberty first kindled on the altars of Christian civilization. Whether descendants of the cavaliers that rode with Rupert or the offspring and kindred of the humbler type of emigrant that, seeking these shores to escape the tyranny of his native land, huddled themselves in the dark and incommodious cabin of the *Mayflower*, braved and bore the dangers of the wild Atlantic, landed on the barren, desolate sands at Jamestown, drove the Indian from his lazy wigwam and idle hunting ground, broke his tomahawk and bow and scalping knife, hewed down the primeval forest, built his home in its remotest depths, erected his altar for religious devotion, and with his Bible, sword, ax, plow, and pruning hook began the work that made this continent the happiest and the holiest spot on all this earth. The kindred and descendant of John Wesley, of Roger Williams, of John Bunyan, of John Knox, and William Penn is alike excluded. The heir of the inherited conception of religion and government that has broken the shackles of slavery and created the very system of civil laws which American courts proclaim to-day is as much under the ban of this bill as is the wild and weird nomad of the desert. It ought not to be so. It is not necessary that it should be so. It is not American that it should be so. Nobody can be less willing to turn the unclean and untutored hordes from the dark places of the earth, with their "chapped hands, greasy nightcaps, and stinking breath" upon our shores to mingle and amalgamate with our population than I am. But a wise immigration policy will not make it so. There is a clean and honest type of labor over there that yearns for the privilege and profit of the plow and hoe and sickle of the southern and western fields now groaning under the burden of costly and inefficient labor. Besides that, there is the home, the American kitchen, if you please, numbered by their thousands and their tens of thousands, where the American housewife, of delicate texture, is crushed under the load of tubs and pots, her beautiful classic brow all "furrowed with care," her little ones tugging at her skirts unkempt and untrained, all because the American servant of former days has gone out in pursuit of the rewards of American industry, to mix

in its struggles and bustles and rush on with the great current of fashion and luxury of American social life. [Applause.] In my district, of 5,468 square miles, I can place 100,000 laborers. Its broad and fertile fields are left untillied for want of labor. Its cotton whitens the ground in winter. Its hedges encroach on the fields. Its ditches hold back the floods. Its great swamps, where modern drainage systems hold out such marvelous opportunities; swamps, Mr. Chairman, which, cut down and drained, will in a single summer produce a growth of corn that if you put a buzzard in the midst of it in August he could not get out without walking to the end of the rows, and yet they are the homes of owls and bats and bears, not for the want of capital, for capital is seeking after them from afar—from north and west; even as far as great and rich Iowa, especially from Ohio and Illinois—but all because the labor to clear and drain and cultivate them is unavailable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may have three additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Our mills are shutting down, not from exhaustion of timber, but from the cost of labor. And then tell me that walls should be erected between these homes and fields and mills and the thousands of willing hands and hungry stomachs that seek so much to share in opportunities which these conditions invite? I enter a heartfelt protest against it, sir. You say they come with un-American ideas and endanger our institutions and our domestic peace and safety. No, sir! Such dangers are confined to congested cities. It is easy enough to avoid this. It is easy enough to scatter them over the broad acres that lie to the south and west.

Move your ports of entrance, establish them along the coast nearer to the fields. These immigrants can not go far ashore when they land here. They do not want to. Their money is exhausted. Their food is eaten up. No wonder they huddle on the East Side and the dark and anarchy-reeking recesses of New York, when you bring them there and put them down.

Carry them to Norfolk, Wilmington, and Charleston and lead them out a few blocks from the dock and the smiling fields and pastures will be opened up to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? I find here that the employment in the Southern States is 100,000—

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. I can not yield.

I protest here and now that the policy of this bill is as unwise and uneconomic as that of Japan before Commodore Perry opened up her ports to the world.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. I can not yield just now, as my time is so limited.

Mr. Chairman, if I had the power, I would defeat this bill. I denounce its policy. I deplore its consequences. Behold the immigration policy, the unutterable national stupidity that can not or will not discriminate between the gentleman of English, French, and German culture on the one hand, and the bashibazouk, with his traditions of murder, plunder, and assassination on the other. In my humble judgment, such is the proper characterization of the pending bill. [Applause.]

Mr. VOLK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers a substitute to the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. VOLK, as a substitute for the committee amendment: Page 5, line 24, after the word "shall," strike out up to and including line 1, on page 6, and insert the word "not."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is not a substitute but rather an amendment. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Washington is well taken. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. VOLK. I believe that the purpose of the amendment or substitute just offered—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. VOLK. On the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled on the point of order.

Mr. VOLK. I ask that my substitute be called an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. VOLK] now offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLK to the committee amendment: On page 5, line 24, after the word "shall," strike out up to and including line 1, on page 6, and insert in lieu thereof the word "not."

Mr. VOLK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment—

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. VOLK. For a moment.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I would like to have the gentleman yield in order that we may have the language read as it would read if amended by his proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. VOLK. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the item as it would read if amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

But aliens included in this proviso who enter the United States before such maximum number shall have entered shall not be counted in reckoning the percentage limits provided in this act.

Mr. VOLK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering this amendment is because of what appears to me a defect in this section of the bill. The bill provides that aliens who are actors or lecturers, singers, and so forth, who apply after the quota of 3 per cent has been exhausted shall not be counted. But if they happen to apply during the time that this 3 per cent is making application, they are counted. So that a lecturer, or an actor, or a singer who comes over here for a temporary period would eliminate from the count some honest immigrant who tries to come into this country. In other words, it is an injustice, because everything depends upon the time within which the application is made, and I believe it would be no more than fair that, if they are not counted after the quota is exhausted, they should not be counted during the time the quota is being lessened. And that is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLK. I yield.

Mr. VAILE. I think the gentleman is under a misapprehension. The provision in regard to actors, artists, lecturers, and so forth, was intended to apply to those who come in permanently. If they come in for a temporary stay they come in under subdivision (5), on page 3, and are not counted at all. It includes aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure. Does not the actor or artist or lecturer who comes here for six months come here temporarily for business?

Mr. VOLK. Then, may I ask the gentleman whether or not there is any particular reason for exempting artists, actors, lecturers, or singers who might come to this country under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Only to make the provisions of the bill a little more liberal. For example, a nurse coming in with any of the other classes is counted as long as there is left anything in the quota to count. After that these particular classes are admitted, but not counted. That is all there is to it. If the gentleman's amendment prevailed, it would be necessary, then, to strike out these classifications entirely.

Mr. VOLK. No; I can not agree with the gentleman from Washington, because if there is no reason for counting these particular classes after the quota is exhausted and if there is no reason for excluding them from the country, then there is no reason for counting them when the quota is being chosen. I believe the same rule should apply. If they are not counted after the quota is exhausted, they should not be counted before, and the immigrant should receive preference and be allowed to come in.

Mr. VAILE. If the gentleman wants the same rule to prevail, then they could not be admitted after the quota is reached at all. We let in those who visit the United States temporarily for business or pleasure without being counted, as the chairman of the committee states. Now, as to these professional classes, they ought to be counted, it seems to me, and if they are professional actors they are counted up to 3 per cent, and after that, in order to make the bill more liberal, we exclude them from the count. It makes the bill more liberal.

Mr. VOLK. Is there any reason why you excluded students from this list?

Mr. VAILE. You might add almost any other class who on the same theory might be admitted.

Mr. VOLK. Students are not admitted under this bill, but they were when the bill was introduced into the last House.

Mr. VAILE. Well, you can not make the bill too liberal without entirely destroying the bill. We thought we were particularly liberal on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state to the committee that he was under a misapprehension as to the scope of the amendment when it was originally offered. The Chair was under the impression that the gentleman from New York [Mr. VOLK] sought to strike out to line 6. The Chair wishes to ask unanimous consent of the committee to withdraw that decision, with the statement that the amendment of the gentleman is in the nature of a substitute and is in order as a substitute. If there is no objection the former decision will be withdrawn, and the amendment will be considered as a substitute.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York does not designate which "shall" in line 24 it should follow. I assume it is the second "shall."

Mr. VOLK. Yes; it is the second "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be corrected accordingly. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FISH rose.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL], a member of the committee, to offer an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIEGEL: Page 2, line 20, strike out "1910" and insert "1920."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, the only argument that has been advanced in favor of the 1910 census has been that the 1920 census would not be available. Yesterday I put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and had read here the 1920 statistics for eight States. I held in my hand, delivered to me this morning, further statistics of nine additional States, including Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, and Maine. By to-morrow morning there will be made public the figures of at least eight additional States, and by Saturday the entire foreign-born population of the United States, taken according to the census of 1920, will be known.

The Director of the Census told me here in this Hall a few minutes before 12 o'clock to-day that the entire census figures would be ready not later than Saturday morning. I insert here the figures which I received to-day:

	California.	Colorado.	Connecticut.	Idaho.	Maine.
Portugal.....	24,517	34	1,200	39	143
Spain.....	11,121	296	1,233	1,416	32
Italy.....	88,503	12,579	80,322	1,323	2,799
Greece.....	10,307	1,802	3,851	716	1,228
Bulgaria.....	271	349	33	39	5
Rumania.....	2,403	394	1,202	104	66
Turkey, Europe.....	264	12	69	5	66
Other Europe.....	654	54	285	45	413
Asia.....	8,982	468	3,123	108	862
Africa.....	708	53	79	44	15
Australia.....	3,994	112	102	57	23
Canada, French.....	2,306	418	14,709	476	35,699
Canada, other.....	57,260	7,203	9,862	4,478	38,492
Newfoundland.....	336	39	336	59	215
Cuba and other West Indies ¹	751	91	312	10	80
Mexico.....	86,638	10,894	42	1,125	9
Central America.....	1,492	5	12	-----	1
South America.....	2,381	178	286	24	16
Atlantic Islands.....	8,892	8	219	23	10
Pacific Islands.....	1,656	39	36	72	4
At sea.....	373	63	73	27	40
Country not specified.....	138	22	205	41	12

¹ Except Porto Rico.

	Massachusetts.	New Hampshire.	Rhode Island.	Vermont.
Total foreign-born white.....	1,077,072	91,154	173,366	44,499
England.....	86,840	4,363	23,755	2,194
Scotland.....	28,473	1,818	5,694	1,831
Wales.....	1,376	70	245	547
Ireland.....	182,818	7,880	22,209	2,880

	Massachusetts.	New Hampshire.	Rhode Island.	Vermont.
Norway.....	5,490	427	545	107
Sweden.....	38,016	1,886	6,537	1,121
Denmark.....	3,617	203	367	154
Belgium.....	2,493	478	968	15
France (including Alsace-Lorraine).....	7,114	288	1,971	197
Luxemburg.....	33	5	14	2
Netherlands.....	2,063	177	138	32
Switzerland.....	1,368	72	210	187
Germany.....	22,106	1,716	3,127	629
Poland.....	69,135	3,997	8,155	1,725
Austria.....	8,085	389	1,289	283
Hungary.....	1,391	66	176	263
Czechoslovakia.....	2,207	78	265	103
Jugo-Slavia.....	950	149	146	36
Ruthenia.....	33	16	2	6
Russia.....	91,711	3,466	8,061	1,327
Finland.....	14,555	1,556	326	476
Lithuania.....	20,784	1,016	795	67

Now, whether it will increase or decrease the number of immigrants which will be permitted to come from any particular country makes no difference, but the point which is involved is that, having taken a census in 1920, that particular census should be used; otherwise we need not have taken any census at all. [Applause.]

I might at this time, Mr. Chairman, read one of the editorials which appeared in this morning's New York newspapers in reference to the entire bill, and particularly in regard to the census proposition. Under the title, "Immigration makeshifts," I read from the New York World of this morning:

IMMIGRATION MAKESHIFTS.

To the emphatic desire of the administration, voiced by the Secretary Hughes, for an immigration law to bar undesirable majority leaders are responding by again putting forward in Congress the plan to restrict admission to 3 per cent of nationals resident here in 1910.

That plan would be grossly unfair and impolitic and would not bar undesirables. On the 1913 figures it would shut out thousands of French, Swiss, Dutch, Spanish, and Portuguese, however intelligent and industrious. It would admit all the British, Germans, and Scandinavians likely to apply; but it would bar more than 200,000 Italians, and a greater number of Russians, though as to these the question is presently academic.

The 3 per cent rule would, in a word, be grossly unfair to all the newer elements in immigration while neglecting the means of barring undesirables among the older immigrant races. It would bar industry and integrity by wholesale while paying no attention to the real needs of the situation. It would not solve but dodge the immigration problem. It would be even more futile and unjust than the illiteracy test.

We have never had a wise and just immigration policy. It was desirable before the war; as Mr. Hughes shows, it is imperative now. The way to get it is to expend thought on the subject, instead of lazily passing a makeshift, which will give just offense to many friendly peoples by its arbitrary discriminations, close the haven of refuge America has been to the oppressed, and, as the minority of the House committee says, "create the most terrible hardships in the United States" among those already here whose relatives are forbidden to join them.

At this point I may say that Secretary Hughes did not agree, request, ask, or urge the adoption of a restrictive immigration bill at this time, and yesterday afternoon he issued a statement to the press to that effect. I insert this dispatch from this morning's New York World:

HUGHES MADE NO ATTACK ON TYPE OF IMMIGRANTS—MERELY QUOTED CONSUL'S REPORT ON "ARMENIANS, JEWS, PERSIANS, AND RUSSIANS."

WASHINGTON, April 20.

A formal statement issued to-day by the State Department said Secretary Hughes "did not make and did not intend to make any recommendations whatever regarding immigration" in transmitting to Congress reports from American Government agents abroad dealing with the movement of emigrants to the United States.

It was stated in an Associated Press dispatch last night that Mr. Hughes made such a recommendation, and he also was quoted as saying "Our restriction on immigration should be so rigid that it would be impossible for most of these people to enter the United States," reference being made especially to Armenians, Jews, Persians, and Russians. As a matter of fact that quotation appeared in a paraphrase of a report from the American consul at Tiflis.

The immigration restriction bill drew sharp fire to-day in the House, especially from Members from New York, and was as vigorously urged by Chairman JOHNSON, of the Immigration Committee, and other Representatives, who declared legislation to keep out undesirable immigrants necessary at this time. Debate will be resumed to-morrow with a vote expected before adjournment.

Among those leading the fight on the measure were Representatives COCKRAN, Democrat; SIEGEL, Republican; CHANDLER, Republican, and LONDON, Socialist, of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. RAKER. I think it would be fair to say that it would be wholly immaterial what kind or character of a restriction bill were presented to the committee. My friend on the committee who has just taken his seat [Mr. SIEGEL] would be opposed to it.

He opposed the restriction plan that passed the House last December. He is opposed to the present bill, and now he wants to change the enumeration upon which we can act from the census of 1910 to that of 1920, which we do not have.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RAKER. Well, I will yield for a question.

Mr. SIEGEL. Does the gentleman believe that the census of 1920 will be ready this week? Seventeen States' figures are out now, and eight more will be out to-morrow morning, and the balance before to-morrow night. Does the gentleman believe that the figures of 1920 census should not be used? Which is it?

Mr. RAKER. I will answer the gentleman's question. They are not out—

Mr. SIEGEL. They are out—

Mr. RAKER. And therefore you can not act on them. The bill, if it passes the House, will pass the Senate and go to the President and be signed, and will become operative on the 10th of May, as it ought to do.

Now, they want to leave the bill in a hazy condition, so that no one can act upon it. There is no question about that. The gentleman admits that it would make no difference whether it be the 1910 census or the 1920 census, and he must admit that he is unable to figure out what difference it makes to any nationality.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman will understand that the census of 1920 has been taken.

Mr. RAKER. That is true.

Mr. TOWNER. And the only thing that is lacking is the announcement of the figures of that census. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] declares that the final announcement will be made at the latest by Saturday of this week. Does not that meet the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. RAKER. No; I do not think so. There is no object in it. This is definite. The bill should go through. The gentleman from New York is opposed to it, and he wants to make some statement that it might be better if we had the 1920 census, but he is unable to present one idea in support of his claim. He was unable to do so when the committee were considering it, and he is unable to do so here, as to why there should be a change from the 1910 census to the 1920 census; but it is confusion that is desired. I say that in all good faith and with due respect to my friend. He just feels as though there should not be any restriction, although he must admit, and all who go into the subject must admit, that there is a necessity and that we ought to pass legislation of this character.

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentleman a moment ago said I did not offer an amendment in the committee making it the 1920 census.

Mr. RAKER. No; I did not say that.

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentleman knows very well that I did offer such an amendment, and I did state in the committee that the figures would be ready this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that gentlemen are undertaking to discuss matters that occurred in the committee.

Mr. RAKER. I did not state that the gentleman did not offer his amendment in the committee. I said he did not give any reason in support of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes the point of order that it is not proper to state what occurred in the committee. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SIEGEL. I did not state it until the gentleman from California opened the doors.

Mr. RAKER. My statement was that there was no reason given to the committee in support of that amendment, and there is none given now, and none can be.

Mr. SIEGEL. I ask that the time of the gentleman from California be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman had not expired, and the gentleman from New York can not take the gentleman from California off the floor.

Mr. SIEGEL. If the gentleman from California will yield for that purpose, I will ask that his time be extended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I shall object to any further extension.

Mr. RAKER. Has my time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman has half a minute.

Mr. RAKER. I should like two minutes beyond my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that when his time expires it be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Now I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIEGEL. Does not the gentleman admit that since 1910 there have come to this country people from small countries like Serbia, and that unless you take into account the figures of the census of 1920, practically no people can come into this country from Serbia? Under the census of 1910, 139 people can come into the United States from Serbia, and under the census of 1920 the number would be about doubled.

Mr. RAKER. All the countries that were recognized by the census of 1910 show their population here according to that census, and those countries that have been changed since then by virtue of the war, those formed out of Austria and other countries that have been changed, like Poland, will have an enumeration by the three secretaries named in this bill, so that every country of that kind will have an enumeration by the three secretaries, and every one will have an opportunity to send to this country the 3 per cent designated in this bill. Now, the gentleman is unable to state, because he can not figure it from the census, but his hope is that there would be a larger number come in under the 1920 census than by using the 1910 census.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My colleague from California [Mr. RAKER] states that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] has not given him any reason for this amendment. To my mind, I think he has, and others have given many good and sufficient reasons why this amendment should be adopted. But, in addition to the reasons that have been given heretofore, I desire, for the information of the House, to give an additional reason that has not yet been assigned.

The provision of the bill states that—

For the purposes of this act nationality shall be determined by country of birth, treating as separate countries the colonies or dependencies for which separate enumeration was made in the United States census of 1910.

Now, a separate classification or enumeration was provided for in the census of 1910, but it was not made as contemplated and directed by the House. The House in 1909 instructed the Director of the Census to make these classifications, but the director stated that a portion of his classifications had already been made, and that he could not comply completely with the resolution of the House. For that reason we never did have a complete classification of nationalities in the 1910 census, but we have it in the 1920 census; and if there were no other reason—and there are many others—in justice to ourselves and to the people who are here and to the people against whom we are legislating, I believe this amendment should be adopted.

As has been stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL], if the 1910 census is adopted it will discriminate against the people who are most entitled to our consideration. It will discriminate against the people of the small nations and Republics that have been created since the war. It will discriminate against immigration from the Balkan States and it will discriminate against Slav immigration, which was demonstrated beyond any doubt during the trying days of the World War. The figures have been given you as to Serbia; and if I had the time I could show how it will discriminate against the other nationalities.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman state whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] would liberalize this legislation and permit a larger number of aliens to come into the country?

Mr. SABATH. It will in a measure. I do not think that it will permit more than 15,000 or 20,000 of those immigrants from the small nations, the Balkan States, to come in if the 1920 census is adopted.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Certainly.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Has the gentleman any figures to show how many might come in from old Russia under the 1920 census? I note that 51,000 can come in under the 1910 census.

Mr. SABATH. That would be from the entire former Russian Empire?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows that Russia has been subdivided—that five different republics now comprise that

country. A certain part of Russia is now a part of Poland; a former part of Russia now includes the independent States of Lithuania, Esthonia, Letvia, and Ukraina.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman's time be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Can the gentleman tell how many would come in under the 1920 census from Russia as it is now?

Mr. SABATH. Hardly none. Russia has not been recognized by this Government, and therefore no passports are being issued over there and none are being viséed. Consequently there is hardly any immigration from Russia, and I hardly believe that there will be in the coming year, but it matters not how many could come if the amendment was adopted. They can not come until the country is recognized by our Government. This country desires to be fair and just and not discriminate against people who have demonstrated their worth. Now, I say that the difference amounts to not more than 20,000, and I believe that later on during the day some gentleman will offer an amendment which will preclude the coming over from any one country of more than a certain number. I myself have no objection to that amendment. I believe that the fears the gentleman and others entertain will be eliminated. I think the discrimination is manifestly unfair. There are also other matters that should be taken into consideration.

I believe in fair treatment to all, and believe it manifestly unfair to discriminate against the newer immigration, as this bill contemplates. That it does discriminate can not be denied by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] or any other Member who has studied its provisions. The adoption of the 1910 census in lieu of the 1920 census was done deliberately to give advantage to the so-called older immigration as against the new immigration, which, to my mind, is inexcusable, unwarranted, and unjustifiable.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, among others, two reasons present themselves why those who favor this legislation should vote against the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] and why those who are opposed to the legislation will vote for the amendment. The first is in the fact that the 1920 census will admit a larger number of aliens. The second is that a study of the immigration problem has disclosed the fact that during the last 20 or 30 years the older and steadier type of our immigration has been relatively small. The number of the older and better immigrants coming has been relatively much smaller during the last 10 years, and the number from southern Europe, Italy, and Russia much greater, which will be reflected in the 1920 census. The making of the 1910 census the basis will give us more of the better and less of the less desirable immigration than if it were based on the census of 1920. The reasons presented by the great immigration commission, which some years ago spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in investigation and study of this great question, present conclusive reasons why we should encourage the coming in of the class which has been extolled so highly as an element which has contributed so much to our life and why it should discourage that which comes from Russia and southern Europe. These people do not go to the farm, do not distribute themselves throughout the country, but collect and congest in cities and other places where they have less opportunity to become producers, home owners, and good Americans. I hope the amendment will not be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, there is, of course, no question in the mind of any member of the committee that if it had been supposed that the 1920 census would have been available, that the figures 1910 would not have been inserted in the bill. Now, we are informed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] that the 1920 figures will be available. Of course, the statement in the bill is made on the fact of the census being taken, not on the announcement of the results of the census. But we are informed that we shall have the results of the census by Saturday of this week. Therefore there can be no possible objection, it seems to me, why the figures of 1920 should not be inserted in lieu of 1910. Let me suggest to the gentleman, further, that if that should be done it will be necessary for him also to change the figures 1910 to 1920 on the fourth page of the bill.

Now, it seems to me that this is only fair. I confess that I have very grave doubts in my own mind as to the practicability of this method of limiting immigration. There are a good many conditions and circumstances that will result in compli-

cating this percentage law and which may not prove very satisfactory. For instance, 3 per cent of any one country only can be admitted, and the 3 per cent will be those who first apply, and then afterwards all other applicants, no matter what their claims for consideration may be, will be excluded. It is doubtful in my mind whether or not this will be a practical method of solving the immigration problem. As gentlemen all understand, this is not the method of the House, it is the method of the Senate. However, I am in favor of a trial of this proposition and I shall support this bill. I am in favor of its application now, because we have an exceptional opportunity for trying this method as an experiment.

This is a temporary measure; it is limited in the time of its operation. When that time has expired we shall then know how practically this legislation operates. If it proves a success, if it shall prove satisfactory to the country, then of course we all will be glad that this tremendous problem has been solved, as far as the principle is concerned, and that thereafter it will only be necessary for us to make application of that principle in our legislation, either to increase or diminish the percentage. Therefore, while I am in favor of this bill and shall support it, I am perfectly willing, and, indeed, I think it is only fair, that this amendment which is offered, which ought to appeal, it seems to me, to the fair judgment of all Members of the House, should be likewise adopted.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Why does the gentleman prefer 1920 in preference to 1910?

Mr. TOWNER. Simply because of this fact. The gentleman, I think, would not have gone back to 1910 if the results of the 1920 census had been available when the bill was drawn. There is no more reason for going back to 1910 than to 1900, or any other decennial period. It is supposed in this law that its application shall be based on the census as it is changed from time to time, as the results are announced from time to time. That is only fair. I can not determine in my own mind that it would change the situation materially. It is probable that it would not very much change it, because we have not had a large immigration during the period of the war. We have sent home to some countries more than they have sent to us, so that I think that there will not be a great deal of change in any event.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have half a minute more in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, is it not just merely whether we want a big 3 per cent or a small 3 per cent, with respect to this amendment?

Mr. TOWNER. As I just said to the gentleman, I think the difference would be very small, but as this percentage is based on a census it is only fair that it should be based on the census last taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman states that the figures of 1910 have been used in the calculations and this is a 14 months emergency bill. The figures of 1910 are available and can be used. I ask for a vote.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. VARE. Is not the purpose in having this census taken to give the House the most recent information?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. VARE. Is it not always customary in legislation of a similar character to use the most recent census?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes. But here is a great moving population of central Europe, and comparatively heavy immigration came to this country from those countries until a

few years ago, and until we can see where some of that European population is going to light, I think we would better stick to the 1910 census.

Mr. VARE. The committee has not given any figures that justify that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, yes.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. I suggest that 1910 is a standard, and as I understand it the figures in 1910 were selected because of certain changes which that census already presents. We might just as well have selected 1790 or any other date that seemed appropriate to determine the number who might come. It is not the purpose to furnish the latest information, but the purpose is to select a date at which the population was so and so and to take 3 per cent of that population.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. In the census of 1910 upon which the calculation has been made you have reached a definite number of persons that can come in and you have that in the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. So that when the committee or the House votes on the measure it will know to a certainty what number of persons may be permitted to come in from any one country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] has information from the Census Bureau about the 1920 census, but has the information been stated in any report or in the RECORD as to the exact number of persons that would come in from each new nation, particularly the little ones?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No. I ask for a vote.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEGEL. Under the 1910 census we can not tell what number of people came in from Poland. Under the 1920 census we can. I put the population figures of eight States in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday and of eight more to-day. They give you these small nationalities according to 1920 census, and all we have to do is on Saturday figure up the 3 per cent. That is the fairest method and the only right method if we want to be fair and square with the country and with the people who came from those countries who are now desirous of bringing in their next of kin. You can not do that under the 1910 census, and you can not tell me to-day how many people can come here from Poland. You are simply guessing and surmising and getting into a nebulous state of mind, in order to help people try to make their own deductions, which can not be done from the report of the committee. Not one Member in favor of the 1910 census can give us the information.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIEGEL), there were—ayes 25, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: Page 4, line 3, add the following: "(11) Wives, fiancées, parents, sisters, and brothers of ex-service men holding an honorable discharge from the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, who are eligible to citizenship and who served in the United States military or naval forces between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to exclude from the 3 per cent limitation the wives, fiancées, the parents, the sisters, and the brothers of ex-service men, particularly of our naturalized and alien ex-service men.

There is no class of ex-service men more deserving of appreciation from this House than those men who served shoulder to shoulder with native-born Americans in the late war. It seems hardly necessary that I should come before the membership of this House and plead with you for a right which is almost inherent by the very act of their serving in our Army in time of war. These men were told by our President when they went out that they were fighting for liberty, justice, and democracy, and now when their families want to come to this country they are excluded unless they come in under the 3 per cent rule. They are excluded from enjoying the privileges of liberty, justice, and democracy which their relatives fought for. Consider, if you will, the record of our alien and naturalized

service men. Consider the make-up of the Seventy-seventh New York Division, composed largely of men of Italian and Jewish origin. The record of those men is written in letters of blood upon the annals of that famous division. We had also from New York State the famous Sixty-ninth Regiment, composed of men of Irish abstraction. Every single division had men of Italian origin, Irish descent, Polish abstraction, and even men of German birth. Alien and naturalized citizens gave up their lives on the fields of battle in defense of our country, and they are just as entitled to bring their families into this country as any other service man. It is inconceivable to me, but I am told by good authority that this amendment will be objected to. It is inconceivable to me that any Member of this House who professes to be a friend of the soldier will oppose this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has the gentleman made any estimate as to the number of persons who might be admitted under this amendment?

Mr. FISH. I have made no estimate whatsoever. It would be very difficult to decide just exactly how many people would apply. Probably 10 per cent of our Army was comprised of naturalized citizens and aliens who were not naturalized.

Mr. SIEGEL. More than that.

Mr. FISH. That would mean about 500,000, and it would be impossible to estimate how many of those men have relatives in Europe who desire to come into this country. This amendment does not go far enough. I would be willing to send a battleship, to send American transports, to the other side to bring those people here if they wanted to come. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let us see, if we can, just how far the proposed amendment goes. It provides those holding honorable discharges in the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, who are eligible to citizenship and who served in the United States military or naval forces between April 6, 1917, and September 11, 1918, may send or bring in wives, fiancées, parents, sisters, or brothers. Now, that means all who served in the Army, including about 400,000 who were not citizens, and it includes, of course, many who were naturalized citizens, who might have relatives or fiancées abroad, and who might want to bring them in, outside or over and above the 3 per cent to be admitted.

Mr. FISH. That is it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. I ask unanimous consent to have five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. All right; but what was the size of our Army?

Mr. FISH. We had an Army and Navy of 4,800,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We will say 4,500,000 men, say. Now, then, if 10 per cent of that great number sent for their relatives and fiancées, or 450,000, and our 3 per cent estimate is 355,000, while the exemptions may run to 100,000 or 150,000, or in all 955,000, perhaps 1,000,000, which would make this no restriction bill at all. And the brothers and sisters would have wives and husbands and children to bring.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FISH. I will yield.

Mr. LAYTON. Suppose that the American people had fallen down to such a pitch of patriotism that in the case of a great war the entire national force fighting for the independence and the safety of this country were composed of aliens, I would be in favor of bringing in the relatives of every one of them. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In that case, would it not be necessary to limit all immigration to certain lines of relatives of those who fought in the Army?

Mr. LAYTON. The point is that if the United States itself had failed to such an extent that we had to depend for our safety upon foreign blood, why then let us have more foreign blood.

Mr. VAILE. But the point is, the Nation has not yet failed to that extent.

Mr. LAYTON. Yes; that is the point.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I do.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Why discriminate in favor of those who are eligible to citizenship?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from New York asks, why discriminate against those who are eligible for citizenship. That

very amendment was put in my amendment at the request of the gentleman from California so as to take care of the Japanese situation. There were Japanese ex-service men.

Mr. MacGREGOR. The point is there are many other ex-service men who have become citizens who still have relatives on the other side.

Mr. FISH. They are all eligible, except Japanese.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What is the difference between the Japanese who fought for the flag and any other man?

Mr. FISH. There is none, in my opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. There is none in mine, either, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. LAYTON. If the gentleman will yield, I am sorry I am trespassing on the gentleman's time, but I apprehend if the gentleman's amendment is passed that they would have to prove conclusively the relationship?

Mr. FISH. Beyond any doubt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask the gentleman if as an ex-service man he thinks that the great rank and file of the men who made up the Army of the United States in the World War desire to put a provision in a restrictive bill that would turn right around and let any number into this country provided they belong to the relative line of the soldiers?

Mr. FISH. My answer to the gentleman is this: Speaking night before last before the George Washington Post of the American Legion in Washington, the largest post in this city and the first post established in the American Legion, they passed a resolution there, some 400 members being present, unanimously adopting such a provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did they make any calculation as to the number that might come in?

Mr. FISH. I do not believe that anybody can make any calculation that is reasonable as to that. I simply say that the relatives of our ex-service men are entitled to come in, and I for one am sick and tired of all this talk of what we are going to do for the ex-service men, and then not doing it when we get a chance. Everybody in this country claims he wants to help the ex-service men, and here is a particular class of them that are aliens and naturalized citizens, amounting to almost half a million, who gave their services loyally to their adopted country and who now ask nothing but the right to bring their own families into the adopted country for which they fought. Now you have a chance to vote in favor of these men, and I hope that Congress will pass this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Proceeding upon the theory of the gentleman, why should the man of Japanese blood who fought for this country be discriminated against?

Mr. FISH. There is no reason in my mind why he should be discriminated against, except that there is an element in this House that would not stand for it. I want to see this amendment go through, and as a favor to those gentlemen I excluded the Japanese from my amendment.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I must decline to yield.

We are talking a great deal in this country about Americanization, of teaching the principles of freedom, justice, and orderly democracy to our alien citizens. Now, if you want to do something besides talking, if you want to do something concrete that will make good American citizens out of those soldiers that fought for their adopted country, and make good citizens out of those of their families who will come here, pass this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. I ask that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended half a minute so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. I notice the amendment does not mention the children of ex-service men, although that condition exists. Was that accidental?

Mr. FISH. It was accidental.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. That is what I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one which naturally appeals to the sentiment of the membership of this House. The eloquent speech that was just delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who preceded me, challenged the membership of the House on the question of whether they wanted to do the right thing by the men who served in our Army and Navy. A challenge like that need not be issued to the membership of this House. There is not a man serving here who does not desire to do the just thing by the men who served under our country's flag. [Applause.] And that patriotic desire on the part of the membership of the House is not confined to the men who served in the war that has just ended—and this amendment is limited to those men—but that desire goes out to all the men of the Civil War, of the Spanish-American War, and of the World War alike. But why is it that when we have a measure like this immigration measure some one needs to throw in an amendment which entirely overcomes the purpose of the measure, in order to seem to favor those who have served in the war? I am willing to go to any length in providing proper legislation to the men who served in the war, but, my friends, four and one-half millions of men served in the World War, and we have a greater duty to those men who served in that war than merely providing an amendment which on its face gives them some preference over other people. We have a duty to those men to provide the proper reconstruction legislation that will place this great country of ours upon a proper footing and take care of them and their families, and this measure helps in making that provision. We have men who served the Government in the late war who are out of employment. Now, is it more important that we shall, perchance, favor some one who served in the war by letting in a fiancée or relative from abroad than it is that we should provide the necessary restrictive immigration legislation, so that the men who served in the war may be able to get employment and so that bread lines may be shortened and prosperity may abound in this land?

We do not want to get shortsighted in this legislation. It occurs to me that many of the arguments that have been made against this bill have been shortsighted. Appeals have been made by the eminent gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] in behalf of the relatives of the people who live within his district and within the city of New York who live in foreign lands, and he says that those people ought to have their relatives come over here and visit them. Of course, that is a matter of tender sentiment. I know that a mother who wants to see her son is entitled to consideration. I know that a son who wants to see his mother is entitled to consideration. But there are sons in California whose mothers are in the Middle States or in New England and who are unable now, and will be for many months, to go and see their mothers because of lack of work, because the economic conditions are such that it is impossible for them to do so. The economic conditions are such that it is impossible for them to do it. Now, this great measure is to help our economic situation here. This act provides—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an extension of time for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks for five minutes additional. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. This act provides that the people who shall come here from foreign lands for the purpose of engaging in business may come. The people that it shuts out are people who come here to engage in employment.

Is not that true? Of course, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] says the State of Texas can take care of the world, and he wants a great many of the Jewish people from abroad to come over here and go on the farms in the State of Texas. Of course, they do not do that. Many of these immigrants go into the larger cities and into our industries. They come over here for the purpose of working. But do not forget this, that when foreigners come over here and take places in the shops of this country, where millions of men are idle, they take places that otherwise would be filled by American citizens already here. [Applause.]

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman tell of a single American that he knows of that is engaged to-day in the large cities of the country in doing the tailoring of the country? By that I mean the manufacture of the garments that are worn by the people. Can he tell us of a single one? Tell us of a single one engaged in the fur trade. American boys will not do that line

of work. Men from the other side of the sea go into that line of work and work hard, and it is those men who supplied the uniforms and the clothing and the shoes for the Army when the war was on, and it ill becomes the gentleman at this moment, on reflection, to refer to them in that manner.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. If the gentleman seems to infer that I am casting any unfriendly reflection on anybody in this country, I wish to assure him he is mistaken.

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentleman evidently means to say what I understood him to say.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I am not speaking in such a guarded way that no single individual or section in this country can possibly take offense, and I think the time has passed when we should guard every word that we say lest some one in our country or in some other country should take exception to what we say. The gentleman from New York seems to think that we have to import people over here to make our shoes and our clothes. He had better get out of the city of New York and go over to the State of Missouri and other States where he will find men engaged in making shoes and employed in other industries.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. I will say to the gentleman that I spent months in going from one place to another in this country, even visiting the farming regions to get information, and tramping around among the farmers for a number of days in order to get information for this session.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I congratulate the gentleman on the able investigation that he has made. [Laughter.] But I do not believe, with all the tramping he has done, that he is able to convince the membership of this House that we have to send to Germany or Austria or Russia or Poland or to any of these other foreign countries in order to get some one to come here to make shoes. [Applause.] Of course it may be true that there are people of foreign birth who are here engaged in making shoes. I am not attacking those people. We are not proposing here to deport anybody. But if the gentleman is so anxious to take care of those people from foreign lands who are already here and are engaged in all these industries, I suggest to him that when he brings somebody else over here to take a job they are liable to take a job away from some of his friends. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. ROSSDALE. I have been listening to the arguments on this general question involved in the amendment and my mind goes back to the days of the World War, to a poster that was displayed in my own city, in my district. The poster was designed by Howard Chandler Christy, a famous artist, and it read, "Americans All," and on it was shown a picture of a soldier and a marine and the American flag, and alongside of that picture were the names of men of Irish birth, of Jewish birth, of German birth, of Polish birth, of Greek birth, of Italian birth, and American names of men of purely English origin, and under them in large letters just two words, "Americans All" and "Enlist," and in truth it was an invitation to enlist. That poster was displayed all over my district, the twenty-third district, The Bronx.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Well, what of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be given five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSSDALE] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] be given five minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Now, by that poster, which was paid for out of the Treasury of the United States, these men of foreign birth in my district were asked to go in and fight for this country, and they did; and I venture the statement that as many men of foreign birth enlisted in the twenty-third district, my district, as enlisted from the district that the gentleman is speaking of, or from any other district in the United States, and I believe that those men who enlisted to fight for this country and who served so well are entitled to some consideration.

I believe that after they have served our country in the hour of need they should receive consideration at our hands, and that we should not stand up here and say "foreigners" when referring to them and their families.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be allowed to put his question in full in the Record. [Laughter.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Let the question be finished as expeditiously as possible. The gentleman is making a fine speech. He is doing very fine. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROSSDALE. These men served this country faithfully. That is admitted. And are they entitled to consideration at our hands, and are they entitled to consideration at the hands of the American-born people in this country? After all, what is a foreigner? We are all foreigners only one or two or more generations back. Look over this House and you will find that the ancestors of its Members, back one or two or three or four generations, were foreigners. They have all made good Americans. That is proven by the fact that they are here. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for supplementing my speech. [Laughter.]

As I was starting to say, I think we owe a great deal to those people of foreign origin who are in this country now and who served this country in our Army and Navy and fought under our flag. I think we owe them a great duty, and the first duty we owe them is to so frame our legislation as to give them an opportunity for prosperity and happiness, and I think one of the main things is to stop the great influx of immigration into this country. Now, we have this immigration law which provides, in accordance with the report of the minority, for 350,461 of them to come in in one year.

It seems to me that is pretty liberal; and we have a provision which seems to have been overlooked, as follows:

That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given, so far as possible, to the parents and minor children of citizens of the United States, and to the parents, wives, and minor children of aliens who are now in the United States and have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law.

So that all in the world the soldier needs to do, if he is an alien and has served under our flag, is to apply for citizenship in this country, and then under the regulations that will be promulgated he will be entitled to all the benefits that this amendment gives him; and if he is not willing to apply for citizenship in this country I am willing to deal fairly with him, but I am not willing to go out of my way in order to see that some one living beyond the seas who happens to be related to him shall be brought over here. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. I ask unanimous consent to amend the amendment by including the words "minor children."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. I ask that the amendment be reported as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 3, add the following: "Wives, fiancées, parents, sisters, brothers, and minor children of ex-service men holding an honorable discharge from the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who are eligible to citizenship and who served in the United States military or naval forces between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. FISH) there were—ayes 55, noes 89.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Yesterday a matter came to my notice in connection with immigration, which I think is worthy of the attention of Congress.

About 10 days ago I had a call from a young man, a resident of one of the cities of my district, complaining of the treatment that he had received at the port of New York, where he had gone to meet an immigrant brother from Italy. I gave this young man, who is a person of good standing in our community, a letter to the department here, and he was very courteously received by Mr. Hampton and assured by him that on his return to the port of New York and to the office of the Immigration Bureau there he would be given a chance to see his brother and be present when that young man was again brought forward for examination as to his qualifications under the literacy test to enter the port of New York.

The letter which I received yesterday complained very bitterly of the treatment that he received at the hands of the immigration officials in New York. I took the matter up a

second time with the department through Mr. Hampton and was assured that he had wired to the officials in New York that this young man should be given a chance to see his brother and attend his reexamination. This letter states that this man went to the office of the Immigration Bureau at 11 o'clock in the morning, stayed there continuously until 5 at night, and frequently asked when his brother's case was to come up, that he was discourteously told by the official in charge to go back and sit down, that he would be notified when his brother's case was to be called. At 5 o'clock he asked if that case was to be postponed until to-morrow, and was then discourteously informed that it had been disposed of at 11.45 that morning, without notification to him and without obedience being shown to the orders from the department here in Washington. If our department heads here in Washington can not convey orders to their subordinates in New York that will be obeyed, it seems to me some one ought to take summary action against that kind of an employee, and it is in order to bring this matter directly before the House and before the bureau that I am making this statement at this time.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I certainly do.

Mr. VAILE. I think if the gentleman's constituent had called this matter to the attention of the commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island, Mr. Wallace, he would have had no difficulty. Mr. Wallace is the soul of courtesy and accommodation to everyone who comes there on legitimate business.

Mr. TREADWAY. Undoubtedly the young man did not get access to him, but only to some subordinate of his. Such a subordinate ought not to have the opportunity to insult or treat in such a manner an American citizen.

Mr. VAILE. It would not be necessary to bring it here for congressional action.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am not asking for congressional action, but I wish to know if we can not get attention to our requests through the department as transmitted by its officials, what is the reason thereof?

Mr. GAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GAHN: Page 4, line 3, after the word "faith," add the following: "or (11) the parents, unmarried son under 21 years of age, unmarried or widowed daughter, grandson under 16 years of age whose father is dead, unmarried or widowed granddaughter whose father is dead, brother under the age of 21 whose father is dead, unmarried or widowed sister whose father is dead, of any citizen of the United States, and a wife, unmarried son under 21 years of age, unmarried or widowed daughter, of any alien who has declared in the manner provided by law his intention to become a citizen."

Mr. GAHN. Gentlemen of the House, this is an amendment providing that relatives of naturalized citizens and those who have declared their intentions to become naturalized citizens may come into this country. I come from a section, Cleveland, Ohio, which is affected by an immigration bill of this sort as much as any section of the United States. We believe there that we can assimilate and take care of the immediate relatives of our naturalized citizens in Cleveland and all of those who have declared their intentions to become citizens. We think that this bill ought not to pass to keep a large number of people out, but that we ought to frame a bill so that certain classes may be included. We think that the immediate relatives of naturalized citizens and those who have declared their intentions should be allowed to come in.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAHN. Certainly.

Mr. MacGREGOR. If the Committee on Immigration of the House had not been subjected to coercion from another source, we would have had that sort of a bill, because that is the bill that the House passed at the last session.

Mr. GAHN. I do not think that the House committee ought to be coerced. It has been said that three or four generations back our ancestors were foreigners. These people in Cleveland are citizens of the United States and fought for our country in the recent war. They are in the same position as the Yankees were in 1776. After the World War is over they want their immediate relatives to follow them, the same as the citizens in the colonial days of the United States wanted their relatives to come over to this country. I think, gentlemen, I ought not to take more of your time. This amendment includes the one just defeated, but I hope you will adopt it, because it takes care of those citizens in the United States who really are affected.

Gentlemen talk about the immigration bill; I do not know whether I am going to vote for it or not. I do not know the exact object of it. I have probably devoted three-quarters of my work since I have been elected a Congressman—perhaps because I am a new Member—to a lot of citizens of my district

in the city of Cleveland who want to get their relatives into this country. So far I have only been able to do it in two instances. Perhaps in a great industrial town like Cleveland we do not know as much about immigration as others, but the people in Cleveland are in favor of a fair immigration bill, and I am inclined to vote for it, but I would like to have this amendment agreed to, so that the relatives of the people of this industrial section can come over.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman has suggested that this committee was coerced in not embodying a similar amendment in the bill now before the committee. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the bill as it passed the House at the last session, before it was acted on by the Senate, there was a different condition provided for. A citizen of the United States 21 years of age and over might under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor apply to him for permission to bring into the United States, if otherwise admissible, a wife, parent, or grandparent, and if the Secretary of Labor was satisfied that the entry of such immigrant would not be in violation of the immigration law and that he was likely to prove a desirable resident of the United States, then such relative might be admitted. Those were restrictions on this enormous blood line that could be brought in under such an amendment. The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio does not carry anything of that sort. Even as the bill passed the House at the last session the principal argument urged against it was that it was altogether too liberal, that it let in all the dependents of the world. The amendment now proposed would cover the earth and be an economic burden to this country, that would have the support necessarily of those relatives. Desirable as it is to go as far as we can in the interest of humanity, we must draw the line somewhere. Now, gentlemen, it would be fine if we could throw open our hospitality to the world, but if we did that we would shortly have no country to which anybody would desire to come. We have got to keep what we have for ourselves and restrict that immigration that wishes to come to our borders. We must do this in justice to the rest of the world, as well as to ourselves. We must not cut out all the restrictions of immigration by any such amendment as this, and I sincerely trust that it will be defeated.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of referring to the matter suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], relating to the conditions at Ellis Island. The Italian society in the city in which I live has passed resolutions relative to the treatment of immigrants at this place, and this matter was taken up by the governor of my State. It was investigated, and in a short letter to me he has made a statement of that situation, which I desire to have the Clerk read in my time for the benefit of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF IOWA,
Des Moines, April 14, 1924.

Hon. C. C. DOWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CASH: You have doubtless received a series of resolutions adopted by the local Garibaldi Society in conjunction with the South Des Moines Improvement League respecting the conditions which prevail at Ellis Island. I have instituted such investigation of the matter as possible, and I am convinced that the situation in the Immigration Service there is deplorable and directly contributed to the untimely death of Mrs. Lucia Leo, wife of Frank Leo, of this city. Mrs. Leo, whose husband is an excellent man in every particular, was received at the island with a very young child and no provision whatever was made for her comfort or convenience. She remained there about 10 days and was not even furnished a bed or other accommodations. The exposure and neglect to which she was subjected so debilitated her that she sickened and died soon after reaching Des Moines. The mental faculties of her husband were so disturbed and impaired by worry and anxiety that he disappeared and his whereabouts are now unknown.

I make this appeal to you as strongly as I can present it, that a rigid investigation be instituted of abuses at Ellis Island. The Italian residents of Des Moines, with whom I have just been in conference, are profoundly concerned.

Always with personal regard, I am,
Very truly, yours,

N. E. KENDALL.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, if this condition exists at Ellis Island, and women and children are neglected in this way, this committee should immediately make an investigation of the situation and present its findings to this House, and action should be taken promptly with reference to the matter and this deplorable condition should be corrected.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. For nearly a year and a half I have been endeavoring to get into the country the wife and two girls of a naturalized American citizen, a Russian. His wife and children are now supposed to be in Odessa, Russia. That city is in the hands of the bolsheviki. It has been impossible to get

into communication with this wife. The husband, who is an entirely respectable man, a good business man, has not seen his family for seven years. Odessa is not very far from Constantinople. I have endeavored to get this little family to Constantinople, and if that were possible they could be brought over here, but we have been unable to communicate with them. This man is in extreme mental distress over the situation. I have not looked into this bill close enough to know whether it would prove a further obstacle to these people coming here, but if it should, I would be strongly constrained to vote against it.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSBORNE. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. This man is a citizen of this country?

Mr. OSBORNE. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Under the terms of this bill if his family came within the 3 per cent they could come in, and during that time they would be given preference over the others in making up the 3 per cent under the terms of this bill.

Mr. VAILE. If he is a citizen of this country his wife is a citizen now.

Mr. OSBORNE. I have three or four other cases somewhat similar. The men are citizens of my city and are all business men, in the markets or something of that kind, in a small way, but are entirely respectable. There are two or three of them who are also from Russia. Their wives are now in Bucharest, Rumania. They have been unable to get a visé to get these families over here. I presume from what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] says they would not be cut off from coming in here. It is on that point that I wanted information, whether this bill would operate to keep those people out of the country.

Mr. GAHN. Already the applications in some countries take up more than the 3 per cent, and the relatives to whom the gentleman refers will probably be lost in the shuffle.

Mr. SIEGEL. I would suggest to the gentleman from California that if he has any mail which he desires to send to the family that he do so through the American Red Cross in New York, which has made arrangements to send such mail through the Red Cross on the other side.

Mr. OSBORNE. I endeavored to do that through the Red Cross. I learned that the Society of Friends, or the Quakers, had an agency in Russia, and have endeavored to communicate with the wife at Odessa through that society, but so far without success.

Mr. SIEGEL. These women will not be able to come to this country unless they can obtain passports.

Mr. OSBORNE. That is the trouble.

Mr. SIEGEL. And they can not obtain them.

Mr. OSBORNE. They are now in Bucharest, and I understand that within six months from the time they came there they must be sent back to Russia unless they receive these visés.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL: Page 6, line 3, after the words "Provided further," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The provisions of this act shall not apply to parents, brothers, sisters, and children of American citizens."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proceeds along the same lines as the previous amendment which has just been voted down, but it is of more general application and is based upon an entirely different theory. The portion of the pending bill sought to be amended provides for a preference of certain relatives of American citizens or those who have applied for citizenship. The amendment which I offer provides that, irrespective of whatever limit is placed by this bill, the parents, brothers, sisters, and children of American citizens are entitled to admission if they comply with section 3 of the immigration act and with the subsequent section as to literacy. Yesterday I asked the question of the committee as to how many immigrants might be allowed to come in from that portion of former Russia which is now known as Poland. On the basis of the census of 1910 there will be entitled to admission at this time some 57,974 persons from all of former Russia.

Mr. SIEGEL. That is a mistake; it is fifty-one thousand and odd.

Mr. HILL. Can the gentleman tell me to-day how many of those come from the portion which is now Poland?

Mr. SIEGEL. The best estimate that we can make—and it is all an estimate under the 1910 census—would be thirty to

thirty-five thousand. I called attention to the fact the other day that there are a little over 40,000 applications for visés by women and children in the hands of the American consul now.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for that information. In other words, under this bill there could come into the United States from thirty to thirty-five thousand persons from what is now Poland, a country whose sons, irrespective of race or creed, fought side by side with ours as an ally in the Great War, while at the same time there could come in 125,157 immigrants from the central nations who are still at war with the United States. On behalf of American citizens whose relatives participated in this war, whose races participated in this war, I say they should be allowed to come in.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this bill will permit 35,000 to come in from Poland?

Mr. HILL. That is what the committee advises me.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman understands that this bill restricts for only 14 months. How many does he want to have come in from Poland in 14 months?

Mr. HILL. In the next 14 months I would like to see every man or woman who is qualified under section 3 of the existing immigration act, properly enforced, come into this country, for they would be people who are absolutely desirable citizens.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Does the gentleman know the number of naturalized citizens in this country?

Mr. HILL. The gentleman does not.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. So the gentleman could not give an estimate as to how many people this would really admit if the gentleman's amendment were adopted?

Mr. HILL. Under my amendment there would be no limit on the brothers, sisters, parents, and children of American citizens who are qualified under the rigid tests of the present immigration act. It might be remembered that the present immigration act was passed over the President's veto by both Houses of Congress, and it is about as rigid an act as could be gotten up.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The point I had in mind, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. HILL. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Is this a restrictive law by which we are proposing to keep certain numbers of foreigners from coming into this country, not necessarily because they are bad, but because we want to limit the number? If the gentleman is unable to tell us how many naturalized citizens there are, and the gentleman is unable to give us the number or how many his amendment will admit, it seems to me that if the amendment were adopted we would be opening the gates without knowing how many could come in.

Mr. HILL. That would be solely—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have one minute more, in order to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please state his amendment again, so it may be clearly understood?

Mr. HILL. Certainly. If the gentleman will turn to page 6 of the bill, beginning on the third line, which is the concluding portion of section 2—which are reservations from the law—after the words "provided further," strike out those six lines and insert "The provisions of this act shall not apply to parents, brothers, sisters, and children of American citizens." Of course, these persons would be subject to section 3 of the immigration law, which is the act of February 5, 1917. No person under that who is not of very high standard of personality, very fit for American citizenship, could be admitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I desire to say a word on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not in opposition, but to speak to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HILL. I request unanimous consent for five minutes more, or such portion of that time as may be necessary, in order to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized on his motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland proposes to place in the class of persons who are not to come under this law the children of American citizens.

It so happens, Mr. Chairman, that I have received a letter from a constituent which, I think, makes a very good persuasive appeal in favor of at least a part of the amendment of the gentleman. I refer to that portion of the amendment which would exclude from the provisions of this bill the children of American citizens.

Mr. HILL. Here is the exact wording of the amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The amendment includes the words "parents, brothers, and sisters." This letter which I have received from a constituent is very strong, I think, in favor of this provision of the amendment in so far as it relates to children of citizens. It is as follows:

1334 MARQUETTE STREET,
Racine, Wis., April 6, 1921.

Hon. HENRY ALLEN COOPER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOPER: As one of your constituents, I beg you to please advise me and help me out of a very aggravating situation. I am taking the liberty of asking this favor of you, because you are the only one that can do anything for me in this matter. My three helpless, motherless children are being unreasonably detained at Warsaw, Poland, by the refusal of the American consul to visé their passports to America. All three children are minors and have become citizens of this country through my naturalization.

For the last six years I did everything within my power to bring my family to this country, but the war intervened. For five long years I lost track of them altogether, and I almost gave them up for lost. Only a year ago I found trace of them again, and then for the first time I learned that their mother died from exposure while they were driven about in the war-ridden, disease-ravaged country of Ukraine. For years they were compelled to live out in the open without shelter or sufficient food and in constant danger of their lives from shells, disease, and pogroms.

Three children, gentlemen, of an American citizen, who has been here six years and more trying to have his family come, their mother dead from exposure.

The horrors and suffering that they have endured sounds unbelievable to human ears. Now that they have survived all, they are compelled to endure additional suffering in the overcrowded, unsanitary, pest-ridden city of Warsaw. The constant appeals that I received from these helpless children are heart-rending. I can not endure it much longer. I have expended several thousand dollars to secure their passage to this country, but of no avail. I ask you to please consider my situation and if anything can be done through the State Department to expedite their coming to America do so without any consideration of expense. I will cover cost of cables to Warsaw or any other expense that may be incurred.

Now, I do not believe that we should pass a law which gives to any consular representative in Europe the right in his discretion to keep this family separated from the father, who is an American citizen. [Applause.]

Mr. ROSENBLOOM and Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois rose.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, even if the amendment were adopted that has been proposed by the gentleman from Maryland it would not cover all the cases of extreme hardship. For instance, I have in my hand a letter that gives me some information of which I was entirely unadvised, and which I suspect is a matter of news to a majority of the Members of this House. A man in my district wanted to get his wife over from the other country, and she was at Warsaw, as I understand it. I wrote to him telling him if he were a naturalized citizen he could bring his wife over here. I got in response the following letter, which is illuminating, and it seems to me to call for some kind of legislation somewhere that will relieve a condition like this. It says:

MY DEAR MR. GRAHAM: I am in receipt of your telegram and letter in regard to Mr. A. Bixgorn, and regret very much to advise that he is not yet a naturalized citizen. He has, however, applied and his application was heard during the last January term, and because of a ruling by the Naturalization Department that no final papers issue where the applicant's wife is a resident of a foreign country, he was refused final papers, and his case continued to the May term. You can readily see the dilemma in which Mr. Bixgorn is in.

He can get no final papers because his wife is in a foreign country, and he can not get his wife into this country because he has no final papers.

Please take this phase of the matter up with the State Department and see if an exception to the rule will be made, and in the meantime I will, on the opening of the May term of court, submit this situation to the examiner and the court and ask for an exception to the rule in force by the naturalization authorities. In any event, any further effort by you in Mr. Bixgorn's behalf will be greatly appreciated.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to say to the gentleman that there was a similar case presented to Secretary Hughes, of a man in Sullivan County, who purchased a farm seven years ago, and then applied for citizenship, but who could not get it because the wife was across the ocean. And the mortgage expired and he could not get a new mortgage because the wife was not here. The law makes it discretionary with the court to admit to citizenship, and they will not admit to citizenship in some cases.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Can not the law be amended to reach a case like this?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to say to the gentleman that there is now in the committee proposed legislation, which we hope to report to the House, to remedy many of these defects.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will it cover this?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If it does not, we will try to have it do so. I assume that a man who becomes a citizen tries to claim citizenship for his wife who is in Russia.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. He is trying to become a citizen, but could not do so because his wife is in Russia, and she could not come here because her husband is not a citizen.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Is not the remedy the granting of separate and distinct citizenship to husband and wife, instead of having it as it is now, with the citizenship of the wife merged into that of the husband?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That may be the remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] has expired.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I believe that I occupy a peculiar position at this time, in that I have heard every word that has been uttered for and against the passage of the bill before this body for consideration. I have given it a great deal of attention, because I wish to exercise such ability as I may have in coming to a correct conclusion.

I have not heard from either side, however, a single word that would justify the defeat of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], which amendment seeks to exempt from the provisions of the bill the wife, parents, or children of ex-service men. Not a single good reason has been advanced that under any analysis could justify the committee which is offering the bill to exclude from its terms and provisions the amendment that has been offered by him.

The greatest objections that have been offered to the bill by its opponents were, first, the unemployment in this country, and that we must take care of those who are here by giving them employment. The second objection that was voiced, or the argument that was advanced for the passage of the bill, was that the class of immigrants who now seek entrance to this country of ours were not of the sturdy type that had built this country into the great Nation that it has become. Both of those arguments, in my opinion, are arguments in favor of the amendment that is before us for consideration at this time. The class that would be exempted under the terms of this amendment will not come into competition with the horny-handed sons of toil, as they have been called here, who are already in our midst. It seeks to allow the reunion of families that have been separated merely by the Great War. And those whose near ones are asked to be granted this exemption are of the same blood and are of the same sturdy type as those who have made this country what it is, and who were here before the Great War or who earned their citizenship by their service in the Army of the United States.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. The gentleman suggested that these immigrants would not come in competition with laborers who are here. Are they going to exist without labor?

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. But I refer to this amendment, which seeks to allow the children and wives—

Mr. VAILE. And brothers and sisters.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Are the parents and brothers, sisters, and children who are coming going to exist without work; and if so, how are they going to exist?

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. With the help of their relative here who is a citizen and can look after them.

Mr. VAILE. Without work?

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. If they will depend on him for sustenance, and he is willing to assume the obligation.

Mr. VAILE. Does the gentleman think that he who is here should be shouldered with that additional burden?

Mr. ROSENBLUM. If he wants to assume that burden we should not interfere with his doing so. The love that some have for their dependents exceeds that held by others. I want to say, as I was about to say when I was interrupted, that the psychology of the objection of those who would come under this amendment does not apply to the extent that we wish to close the doors against them, to speak in plain language. I will say that in the final conclusion I am going to vote for this bill—

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENBLUM. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If I recall correctly, the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland does not specify minor children or anyone under the age of 21.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. I will speak for it on that basis.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes in which to explain the amendment?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Just a moment more. I have just been informed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] that this amendment goes beyond the age of 21, covering brothers and sisters.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. Yes; even granting that, I speak for the adoption of the amendment, and for this reason: The men who have built up this country—and I regret that I feel that it is even pertinent to mention the fact—are of a class of immigrants that, I regret to say, we will not anticipate at this time from European countries, because there is not a man or a woman in this country to-day who is not descended from that sturdy type of immigrant who, in order to advance his spiritual, mental, and political desires, to have greater opportunities for the cultivation of himself spiritually and mentally, and not for his physical comfort alone, came across these waters to strange lands to find new opportunities, and those who were left on the other side who would not make the sacrifice of emigration to better their spiritual and political condition who now wish to come, only to better their physical comfort, we do not need or want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an extension for about three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. I want to say, gentlemen, that the situation in regard to those who are the children and the relatives of men who are already here is not the situation of that great horde that merely to satisfy its desire for physical comfort now wishes to come from a land which has become poverty stricken. The men who came here before this great war and entered into our battles, the men who came here, whether they came on the *Mayflower* or on the *Oceanic*, came here knowing that they would meet the forces of nature with which they must contend for a living, and it is the descendants of those men who are now in a position to ask for their children and their parents to be allowed the opportunity to join them here. It is those people who made this country great. And it is to those men, whose sacrifices have made it possible for us to meet here, enacting the laws by which we shall live, that we owe the duty to preserve for those who come after us the opportunity and the privilege we and our forefathers found by reason of their sacrifices.

As I said before, I am going to vote for the bill at the conclusion of its consideration. I am going to vote for it, but I say to you that you do not go far enough in this bill. The chief purpose of this legislation is to keep out undesirable citizenship. We all realize that there is undesirable citizenship in this country to-day, and that is only natural.

You want to protect the body politic, and yet you pay no attention to the disease that is already in the body. You say you will adopt a preventive which stops the ailment at the mouth. You would keep out that type of citizenship which is attempting to destroy our institutions and which is not good, and yet you propose no legislation to deal with the undesirable alien already here. I shall introduce amendments that will reach the trouble that you are trying to reach by this legislation. I shall introduce an amendment providing that when a man has been in this country for two years he must either renounce his allegiance to the country from which he came, take out his citizenship papers, or be deported at that time. I have another amendment providing that at the expiration of three years from

the time of taking out his first papers he must take out his full citizenship papers or be deported. I have another amendment which provides that if, during the probationary period, an alien is convicted of a felony he shall, at the expiration of the sentence of the trial court, be deported as an undesirable alien. In other words, we welcome the worthy of all lands to come and make this their home, but we do not intend that our country shall become the international boarding house of the world. As has been well said, a man will not make the sacrifice for his boarding house that he will for his home. Neither will he love or cherish it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more for further explanation of the amendment.

Mr. VAILE. Pending that request, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be concluded in 12 minutes. That will give 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ROSENBLUM], and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], and 5 minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be concluded in 12 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, is that on this amendment only?

The CHAIRMAN. On this amendment and all amendments to it.

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman make it 17 minutes.

Mr. ANSORGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] suggests that the gentleman from Colorado modify his request and make it 17 minutes.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado withdraws his request. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ROSENBLUM] asks for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENBLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion that no man has a greater interest in this country than I. During the recent campaign the Republicans were charged with selfishness in their view of international obligations. This bill may be criticized as selfish, but self-preservation is the first law of man, and the Nation is but the group of individuals and self-preservation is a national duty. I come here with a mandate given me last November, when the issue was before the people of my district, where they spoke clearly, and in no place did they speak more clearly than in our great centers of population, where they say we can not stand these additional citizens. The issue in that campaign was "America first," and the great States of Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, which you seem so fearful will not be able to assimilate these children and wives and parents of the men already citizens—those States in solemn and earnest terms said, "America first," and I am willing to back that up. I will cast my vote in accordance with the mandate of the people, and I shall vote to support this bill. The whole world is upset, we must have a breathing spell to look about us, and the 14 months provided for in this bill will afford that opportunity.

But at the same time, gentlemen, these amendments should be regarded by all as among the vital things that the people spoke for. It should be remembered that these men, to whose loved ones these amendments apply, were called upon to prove their loyalty to this country. These men were of the blood that we want in this country, and those parents who brought them into the world had in them the blood that we want. The children of these men have in them the blood that we want in this country, and they should be given first preference by all means in order that this country shall continue the greatest of all countries, and that this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. PADGETT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. PADGETT. I want to make a statement to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. PADGETT. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order.

Mr. SABATH. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Tennessee may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, a letter was read a few minutes ago in reference to the difficulty experienced by a constituent of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] in getting his children here. I think it might be of interest to the House to make a statement in regard to a similar case. At Franklin, Tenn., there were two brothers, Louis and Frank Brodsky. Louis Brodsky had a wife and four children and Frank Brodsky had a wife and two children, and during the war they were unable to locate them or get any information about them. We got the State Department to endeavor to locate them by sending cablegrams to the consuls, but they had no communication and could not find them. About a year ago they sent an ex-soldier over there, and he finally located them in Bucharest. Mr. Louis Brodsky was naturalized some time ago, and his wife and four children sailed on the *Morissania* from Antwerp on March 26, landed and passed through, and are at home in Franklin, Tenn., now. On March 22 Mr. Frank Brodsky completed his naturalization. The clerk of the district court of the United States wired me that he had gotten his final papers. I called the matter to the attention of the officials in the State Department, and on Wednesday morning the 23d they cabled the consul at Antwerp instructions to secure an emergency passport for Sarah Brodsky, the wife of Frank Brodsky, and to make proper notation of his two children, and the day before yesterday I received a copy of the answer of the consul, stating that the passport for Sarah Brodsky and the two children had been secured and delivered to them and that they would sail on the next steamer. So that I am at a loss to understand how it is that these children failed to get passports, unless there was some objection on account of disease or something of that kind that may be prevalent and may bar the visé of that passport under some other provision of the immigration laws.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did they come from Bucharest?

Mr. PADGETT. They were located at Bucharest.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Were their passports viséed at Bucharest?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How many applications were there on file at that time at Bucharest?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know about that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is a very important item, indeed. There are 40,000 applications on file at Warsaw, and it is left to the discretion of the Government officials there. Does the gentleman think it should be left to the discretion of an executive officer anywhere to keep the minor children of an American citizen from coming to this country when they are free from disease?

Mr. PADGETT. Not as stated by the gentleman; but I think it is entirely proper that the investigation should be made over there as to the status, character, and condition of immigrants.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is a different thing.

Mr. PADGETT. There are many passports that are fraudulent and forged, and an investigation should be made over there.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit another suggestion?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the children were in good physical condition, free from contagious disease, it still would remain in the discretion of an executive officer to visé their passports or not?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I do not think that is the trouble. I think if the gentleman will go to the State Department—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. One moment. Would not that officer over there have the right in his discretion to do that? And ought that to remain in the power of any official, to deprive an American citizen of the right—not a privilege but a right conferred by the Constitution? The Constitution of the United States makes him a citizen. Ought we to leave it to an executive officer to deprive any American citizen of the right to the company of his own minor children in good physical condition?

Mr. PADGETT. Under the law—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want an answer to that question.

Mr. PADGETT. Under the law the children do not become citizens of the United States upon the naturalization of the parent until they actually arrive in this country.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TOWNER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. May I have another minute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that his time be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. I think if the gentleman's constituent will show the State Department that he is a naturalized citizen and that these are minor children, the State Department will provide that they may reach the United States, and will do it by cable. They did it for me within the last three weeks.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That was from Bucharest?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they sailed from Antwerp.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I know, but the visé was obtained at Bucharest, where there are very few applications.

Mr. PADGETT. No; they were at Antwerp when the instructions were sent, and the consul at Antwerp obtained the passports from the embassy in Belgium.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How were they permitted to leave Rumania and go to Antwerp?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know about that. I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The case is not quite parallel with this one.

Mr. PADGETT. What I am showing is that the State Department will interest itself and will instruct the consuls over there to look after these minor children of this naturalized American citizen, and they will do it by cable.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion right there in that connection?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. This act as now framed, in the very sentence which the gentleman from Maryland proposes to strike out, provides that in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given as far as possible to the parents and minor children of citizens of the United States.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the present practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, rising again to speak on behalf of this amendment, I want to say a thing which everybody here knows, but which seems at times to be questioned. There is not a gentleman in this House nor a lady, since we have one such Member, who does not stand for America first. There is no question about that. But we are here to-day in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to find out what is best for America, and I say that without this amendment this bill is not an American bill. What does this amendment mean? I voted last week for an antidumping bill to prevent the dumping of manufactured products into this country, and I will vote for any bill to prevent the dumping of undesirable aliens into this country. Under this bill, with my proposed amendment, you will not get one undesirable immigrant if the laws of the United States as at present existing are enforced.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. Not yet. I helped enforce the immigration laws of the United States from 1910 to 1915. The laws of those days were comparatively mild and nondrastic. I never saw the existing immigration bill until last night, and I do not think the majority of the Members have seen this present existing immigration bill, the law of February 5, 1917. If you will turn to section 3 of the present bill you will find that if you open the doors to the parents, brothers, sisters, and children of existing American citizens you can not, if the law is enforced, get one undesirable immigrant under existing law. I will read you the paragraph 3 of the existing law.

That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons; persons who have had one or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; persons of constitutional psychopathic inferiority.

Under that term "constitutional psychopathic inferiority" you could keep out absolutely any person in the world. I know that in the Twenty-ninth Division during the war we discharged for "constitutional psychopathic inferiority" a large number of men that had come into the division. Under that clause you could keep out any undesirable alien. We hope the immigration laws will be enforced with that spirit that has come through a change of administration at the other end of the Avenue.

Mr. ANSORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have two minutes remaining, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LINDBERGER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not yield the balance of his time.

Mr. HILL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I desire to occupy that time myself. Here is another one of the elements of exclusion under the existing law, "persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes who are found to be and who are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such physical defects being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living."

Then there is in the existing law another page of exclusions, and a provision that they must be able to read. I say to you, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, that if you adopt this amendment you will give the privilege to these mentioned persons, parents, brothers, sisters, and children of American citizens, of coming in here, and we can not have too many persons of the kind who can pass examination under the present immigration act, if that law is strictly enforced.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANSORGE] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANSORGE. Mr. Speaker, I can not see anything objectionable in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] stated a moment ago that in the bill passed by the Sixty-sixth Congress there had been included prior to the time the bill was submitted to the Senate a clause, which was accepted by this House, which, in my opinion, was as broad, if not broader, than the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Maryland. I refer to section 4, subdivision a, of the former bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit me, the gentleman understands that bill had no 3 per cent exemption. Now we have a bill with the 3 per cent exemption, and if we had the blood line and the side line admitting the brothers and sisters and children you would have no restricted bill.

Mr. ANSORGE. Let me ask the chairman of the committee whether he favored limiting it to 3 per cent? Whether he did not oppose the 3 per cent provision altogether?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I could not say that. The gentleman must remember that in the other bill we had a plan by which those undertaking to bring in blood relatives must secure a permit, and, if necessary, put up a bond.

Mr. ANSORGE. I would like to ask the chairman of the Immigration Committee whether he contends for one moment that the preference clause in the proposed bill as submitted by the majority of the Immigration Committee would admit an alien such as suggested by the gentleman who spoke a moment ago. In other words, the point I make is, and I believe the chairman will agree with me, that the preference clause does not guarantee the admission of that particular alien who happens to come within the exceptions of the act unless he gets in first and has his passport viséd. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Here is the trouble now. The world is in a period of unrest. The United States has a passport system by which visés are required on passports issued by other countries. In spite of that we have a period of congestion at Ellis Island, which is unfortunate. The purpose of this bill is to provide a plan which would relieve the congestion and reduce the immigration 50 per cent. The direct blood line of relatives in the last House bill was extended to collaterals, thus making it an indefinite number.

The result of all that is that it was finally rejected, and the percentage system substituted, both being in the hope of reducing temporarily immigration until we can find out where the world is going to light and how our passport system is going to be straightened out.

Mr. ANSORGE. Very well. I am sufficiently broadminded to realize the gentleman's point and to see it very clearly, but I take now from the gentleman the admission that the blood line relatives of American citizens in this country are not objectionable per se, and it merely comes down to the question of labor which was raised by the gentleman from Texas—and you all know whom I mean [laughter]—in a question asked of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] in the debate of yesterday. Therefore, if time will permit, I shall now devote myself to the question of labor. I want to remind the Members of this House there is to-day and there will be to-morrow a dearth of basic labor in this country. Let me remind Members of the House that the people who built the subways of New York, the people who built the railroads, do not live in this country to-day. They have graduated, because the man who built the subways during the war obtained a position in an ammunition factory and received from six to seven and eight and ten dollars a day, and that man, or the immigrant son of that man, will not do that kind of work to-day. [Applause.] You are going to find, when you pass your permanent tariff bill and you open up our factories and you

begin turning the wheels of industry, that there is going to be a shortage of basic labor in this country, and I refer to the man or the woman who is willing to do a hard day's work for \$3.50 a day, the man who does not compete with American labor, the man who does not do the skilled work of our country to-day. You have passed a so-called emergency tariff bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANSORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, every speech made on this amendment has been in favor of it, and when the gentleman concludes I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for five minutes, and then I shall ask that debate be closed on this amendment.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Colorado realizes that he can not make the right kind of an argument against the amendment, and that is the reason all of the speeches are in favor of it.

Mr. VAILE. I have been on my feet whenever a Member rose in favor of it and have retired each time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes at the expiration of the time of the gentleman from New York. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from New York proceeding for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for half a moment?

Mr. ANSORGE. I will yield for half a minute by the clock.

Mr. VARE. Augmenting the gentleman's statement in respect to labor conditions in the country, I desire to call the attention of the committee to a newspaper publication of yesterday, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. Looking over the advertisements for help wanted, I find there are five columns where people have advertised for female help. In other words, they are short of help; and there is one column of females who have advertised for situations. That is five to one in favor of those who are seeking employment. On the other side there are three full columns of male help wanted. The manufacturers have not sufficient help to run their factories in Philadelphia. Against those three columns I find one column of males asking for employment.

Mr. ANSORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time which has been consumed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania do not count as a part of my time. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must not yield if he desires to use his own time.

Mr. ANSORGE. I yielded for half a minute, and I wanted to be courteous. However, the gentleman has raised a point along the line of the argument I was pursuing. We must take into account that we have a great many women in this country who are or are not voters, but who nevertheless have servant troubles, and I remind you that for the past two years and during the entire period of the war it has been practically impossible to procure adequate servant help. The bar against immigration which you are now attempting to raise is going to react, I believe, upon the country and upon our great Republican Party. We are about to pass a permanent tariff bill, which we have promised the country will open up the factories and the channels of trade.

The unemployment in 1914 was not because of the aliens, but it was due to eight months of operation of the Underwood tariff law, and at that time, when there were 3,000,000 people out of employment in this country, we did not seek to pass a bill raising bars against immigrants. I shall vote for this amendment.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that the gentleman from New York is not speaking to his amendment. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. ANSORGE. If the gentleman says that I am not speaking to the amendment, he has not been following the argument. I shall vote for this amendment because it weakens the bill, if you will have it so [laughter], for the very reason that it will permit to come into this country the blood relatives of the man who came here and became an American citizen, relying upon the fond hope that some day he might bring his family to this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. The time has not been limited on this amendment, has it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been limited. Everyone who now speaks must obtain permission to do so by unanimous consent.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the gentleman from Colorado concludes I may have five minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. VAILE. I shall not object, Mr. Chairman, but debate on this has been running for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes at the expiration of the time of the gentleman from Colorado. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, in the last remark of the last speaker we find the real reason for the tremendous enthusiasm in favor of the adoption of this amendment, namely, that the amendment would weaken the bill. Now, we tried to give you something honest and something intelligent. When we passed the other bill it was a bill for exclusion, but on that, in the interest of humanity, we simply had to engraft certain exemptions. Now, those exemptions are broadened out tremendously under the scope of the present bill, because here we have a general exemption of 3 per cent. Three per cent of the people of all nationalities resident here under the 1910 census can come in, and if the gentlemen want those exemptions extended they must show, if they are in favor of the bill, that their people would be injured by not being able to get in under the 3 per cent. Now, we find here in the minority report that all but 2 per cent of the people in Warsaw, 40,000, will come in to go to relatives.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest sympathy in the world for the people of Warsaw, but frankly, if we are going to pass any kind of a suspension bill, we can not let all in, and I say that knowing it will mean some broken hearts. We can not let every one of them in, we can not let all but those 2 per cent in. If they can come in they must come in under the 3 per cent. Now, this is a temporary bill, gentlemen. It lasts for a year. Are not you willing to wait and see how many of these people you are pleading so hard for are going to be injured by waiting, and if you are sincere in saying you will vote for the bill, you ought to be sincere in putting it to that test. That is particularly true, gentlemen, of the tariff argument, because it does go to the gist of this identical question, and I want the gentleman from Texas to give attention to this: Every one of us on this side of the aisle went out through our districts last fall and urged a protective tariff. For what reason? Because we wanted to protect American labor. We told the workmen in our district that a tariff would help them, that it would prevent any great reduction of wages, and would maintain the standard of living, and that it would prevent the competition of underpaid foreign labor. Where? In foreign countries; not here. We told the working people of our districts that we would prevent the competition of foreign labor on the foreign farm and in the foreign factory. That is just the argument we made, and it was made in good faith and the American people believed it. Now, some of you gentlemen on this side turn around and say, "Oh, very well, we will not let foreign labor compete in foreign countries, but we will bring it over here and put the foreign labor into your front yard and let it compete with you here." Why, the people we talked to last fall would have the right to say to us, "Your tariff talk is a snare and a delusion; you are not acting in good faith." If we do not pass this bill or a bill like it they will have a perfect right to say our tariff talk was made for the protection of the employer and not for the workman of this country.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. I will.

Mr. PADGETT. Why limit it to 14 months?

Mr. VAILE. We expect by that time to work out a permanent, far-reaching immigration policy after we have had a chance to see what is actually going to be developed in the way of the fears expressed—

Mr. PADGETT. Not by me; I am in favor of the bill. I am asking why the gentleman limits the time. The gentleman said the tariff was to build up and protect them from competition on the other side and this bill was to protect them here—

Mr. VAILE. No; I said the tariff protected us here, both classes—

Mr. PADGETT. Then why limit it to the 14 months?

Mr. VAILE. I would be perfectly willing to have it longer. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened with considerable interest to the discussion of this amendment, which is intended to weaken, as admitted, if not defeat the bill. Now, the real purpose—and there is no need of camouflaging what our friends are after—they want to defeat this bill; many of them admit that fact, while others plead, as they say, for humanity. Some of our friends—

Mr. ANSORGE. Will the gentleman yield for just one moment—for half a moment?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. ANSORGE. Does not the gentleman concede that by weakening one of these clauses and making the bill broader it will help to carry the bill?

Mr. RAKER. I realize what the gentleman is figuring on and what those who are taking the same position figure on. They want to make the bill so weak, pour a little more water here and a little more there and make it so weak that nobody who is in favor of restriction can afford to vote for it. That is what gentlemen are figuring on, and it is practically admitted. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. I would like to know what the gentleman had in his mind when he said he would pour in water and make it weak. Has the gentleman a percentage in his mind?

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman wants to bring it to one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. RAKER. That is not bothering me right now. There have been some who have objected to the law that is on the statute books, but some people have a mania for kicking. They have been objecting to everything for the last few years, and they think they ought to do so now. As a matter of fact, the very law that they are contending against was passed by almost a unanimous vote upon both sides of the House, and that is the passport law, one of the best pieces of legislation that our friends placed upon the statute books last session with the help of Members upon this side for the purpose of regulating to some extent, at least, the question of immigration to this country. Now, by what possible method of reasoning can a man who is a resident of this country and who came here at his own volition and became naturalized under our laws, as a question of justice or humanity, if you please, demand that his brothers, all of them, should come to this country? What method of reasoning can any man present that, because a man has come to this country and has sought its privileges, he can of right demand that his sister should come to this country, and that we are unjust to the peoples of the world if we do not put down the bars and permit to come here all the brothers and all the sisters of the people that may have come to this country and who live here, and that we are unjust if we do not?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I would like to ask the gentleman if there are any better hands in which an immigrant could fall than into the hands of an American citizen who is already in this country?

Mr. RAKER. That does not mean that he is an American citizen by his choice. He complied with the laws of this country and said, "I will abandon those of the old country from which I came and join yours." That brother stayed in the old country and was better satisfied than the other man was in this, and that sister remained in that country and did not desire to come to this after the bars have been let down and it was easy for her to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does it not salt itself down to the fact that some Members want, apparently, to keep them all out and at the same time let them all in?

Mr. RAKER. That is the thing exactly. Now, when it comes down to that, we need to guard and protect our own homes and look after our own front yard and our back yard, if you please, and we should not shed so many tears upon the countries abroad, but should look to our own poverty—there is plenty of it in this country—and our own sufferings. There have been a few isolated cases cited in regard to some one who has written for those to come from foreign countries. That is quite natural. But how many thousands of letters could the Members of this House present of suffering humanity in our own country that you are not providing for? We want to delay this immigration until we get our own house in order. That is all. In the meantime we can pass a real, genuine immigration law, treating all as they should be treated and at the same time properly safeguard the interests of the United States. It is best to pause for a few months and let the present situation readjust itself, both here and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 17, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Page 4, line 3, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following:

"(11) Aliens who may apply for temporary admission not exceeding eight months in each year for employment as agricultural laborers, and such aliens may be admitted, notwithstanding they may be unable to comply with the literacy test of the immigration laws, subject to such provisions regulating their admission and return, including the exaction of bonds, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the main provisions and the main features of this bill. I think there are exceptions that will not apply to all conditions and to all matters in this connection. I refer to a very serious condition now existing in the agricultural portions of this country that are given over to the growing of sugar beets. In my district in Colorado there are large sugar-beet factories. I know the growers of those beets. I know it will be impossible for them to secure hand labor for this work unless this amendment should be adopted or unless the Secretary of Labor will, as he has for the past several years, issue an order in violation, I understand, of section 3 of the immigration act of 1917, and allow them to come in for a period of six to eight months in order to engage in this labor. In our locality we had to depend exclusively, almost, on Mexican labor. They are well equipped for this work, and they are contented to do it. It is work that can not be accomplished by American labor. It is true that we have some Japanese laborers that are engaged in the work in Colorado, Utah, and other beet-growing States. The biggest part of the work has to depend upon the labor of these Mexicans. Having been given permission to come into the country and to return to their own at the end of their period of labor, we have never found any difficulty. We find they have always complied with the order of the department and have returned to Mexico, and they come back with their families the following year.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I will.

Mr. BOX. Does the gentleman make that statement to the effect that they will return, after having read the official reports in regard to the matter?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I will advise the gentleman that I did not speak from the official reports, but that I speak from a personal knowledge of several years in connection with this very question.

Mr. BOX. Is it not a fact that the report of the Commissioner General for 1920, on page 8, shows that over 60 per cent of them do not return?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I have not seen that report, but I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any information that those who did remain were undesirable in the sense—

Mr. BOX. And I will say to the gentleman that I have read a great many press reports, and I have read complaints that they have been found out of employment, have been convicted as vagrants, have been placed in chain gangs because they could not get work and were technically guilty of the vagrancy laws of the State. I read a newspaper report published in the capital of the gentleman's State—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman from Texas does not say that they put them in ball and chain in order to keep them from going out?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I have not any knowledge of the conditions in reference to that, but if it is so it is different from the conditions that have existed for three or four years in the territory of which I have knowledge.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I yield.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I appreciate the situation of the gentleman from Colorado. On page 3 of this bill I note that aliens who have resided continuously for at least one year immediately preceding the time of their admission from the Republic of Mexico are excepted.

Mr. VAILE. But they must still comply with the literacy test. That does not exempt them from the operation of the literacy test.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. My attention was called to that, and at first blush I thought, as the gentleman thinks, that it would admit them, but I find on examination of the law that they must submit to the literacy test.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to crowd out anybody else who may desire to speak, but I am from the State of the gentleman [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] who just proposed this amendment.

This amendment is very earnestly desired by my best friends. Perhaps I am making a great mistake from the standpoint of my political future in rising to oppose it, but I do not propose to stand here and legislate for the State of Colorado merely. This is a striking example of the very thing that I urged upon you gentlemen of the committee yesterday when I said that the argument is made here and addressed to every single Member of the House that "You need this for your district." Your district makes clothing. Very well. You need more laborers in the clothing business. Let laborers come in for the clothing business. We had seven gentlemen from the State of New York, representing every political party in this House—three of them—urging that labor be let in, of course primarily for the State of New York, although I know they were sincere in believing that it would be for the benefit of that part of the country interested in letting them in.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentleman does not mean to tell the House that but seven Members of the House asked for that?

Mr. VAILE. Seven Members of the House from the city of New York, or from the State of New York, are opposed to this bill.

Mr. SIEGEL. That is another story.

Mr. VAILE. Well, let the correction stand that way. Then you have people from the iron and steel business, and they want laborers to come in to work in their business. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] argues that labor is needed. He did not particularly refer to his own district, but no doubt he had its great manufacturing enterprises in mind. Perhaps labor is needed in some places, but as I showed you yesterday the need for labor is not general, and, on the contrary, the general need is for jobs. [Applause.]

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. Yes.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I know that the gentleman is well acquainted with the conditions in Colorado with reference to the growing of beets.

Mr. VAILE. I do know that Colorado needs labor for the growing of sugar beets.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Can the gentleman tell us from what other source we can secure this labor except the Mexican labor?

Mr. VAILE. Well, there are thousands of people who need work in New York City.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Are they willing to work?

Mr. VAILE. I said yesterday, and I am forced now to say it again, although it refers to my own State, that if we have to have another servient race brought into this country in order to promote production, then let us get along without the production, even if it hurts an industry of my own district. [Applause.] If Americans want their industries to continue, we must learn to work in them ourselves. It has been the ruin of every nation that has ever tried it to continue to have one class that is too good to do any part of that nation's necessary work, and another separate class or race that had to do all the hard work or all the dirty work. That distinction is the basis of this amendment. It is the starting of a social condition, involving a dominant and a servient race. That condition has nearly wrecked us before.

First we brought in the negro to do work which the white man was not willing to do. There was an excuse for it. It was a semitropical part of the country. The white men could not very easily do the work that was required, and at least did not want to do that work in the fields. That experiment of a servient race and a dominant race left us a problem that has never been settled, and may never be settled with complete satis-

faction to the white man and with complete justice to the black man.

What happened on the western coast? We brought in Chinamen to build our railroads and work in our mines. Then we drove out the Chinamen, with disgrace to ourselves and violence to them. Now, on the Pacific coast they want to drive out the Japs and I agree that we do not want any more of them. But, forgetting the experience of 40 years ago, some Californians say: "Let the Chinamen come back in. We need labor again."

Here now is a proposition to let the Mexican in. I like the Mexican, but I do not think American communities ought to be made up of Mexicans, or that we should have new colonies of these people who do not speak our language or understand our laws. The gentleman says these are only temporary. What is the assurance that they are going to be only temporary? If they are to be only temporary then some sort of duress must be employed to be sure that they stay where they are supposed to stay and that they go out when they are expected to go out. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] calls attention to the fact that 60 per cent of those admitted as temporary laborers have not gone out. If they are to be permanent, then we are bringing into our country a new and entirely different and for that reason an undesirable element of our population, and in my judgment it is not a good thing to do. [Applause.] If they are not to be permanent then they must be subjected to some sort of compulsion to insure the temporary character of their stay. Such compulsion means peonage, and that, if possible, is still more undesirable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane, this being a bill to limit the immigration of aliens and the amendment being intended to admit aliens under bond.

Mr. SABATH. What is the ground of the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The base of the point of order is that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes a point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana rise.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I want to speak in support of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this bill is to restrict the number of immigrants that can be admitted to this country under the law. It does not purport to let in anyone who is not otherwise qualified to come in under the law. This particular section is the section limiting the number to 3 per cent, and then giving the deductions that may be made from that 3 per cent. The proposed amendment, if the Chair will notice, proposes to amend the immigration laws so as to permit certain persons to enter this country who otherwise would not have the right to enter.

Now, the purpose of the rule is to prevent legislation being enacted without notice to the Members. No Member would be notified that we were attempting to change the immigration law so as to permit persons to enter the country who otherwise would not have the right to enter it, and I say that the removal of the restrictions on immigration would not be permitted under a bill which merely limits the number who may come in.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that paragraph (a) of section 2 makes an exception of certain people of certain countries. This amendment also attempts to make a further exception, and for that reason I think the point of order should not be sustained and can not lie.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit the Chair to propound an inquiry to him concerning the matter he is now speaking about?

Mr. SABATH. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. As to whether the class of persons included in subsection (a) will not have to meet the other requirements of the immigration laws?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but this does exempt them from the operation of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But not from section 3 of the immigration law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment under consideration seeks specifically to change the existing immigration laws so far as the literacy test is concerned. It excepts a certain class from the literacy test. If this amendment should be held in order, it would then be in order to add other classes to enjoy the same exemption and also to exempt them from other provisions of the immigration law. Instead

of a bill confined to one main purpose, namely, that of placing a limitation on the number who can enter the country under the existing law, we would be considering a general revision of the immigration law. Such a procedure would lead to interminable amendment. This amendment is clearly not germane to the bill, or to any provision of the section now under consideration. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SIEGEL. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIEGEL: Page 6, line 3, strike out the six lines following the words "Provided further," and insert therefor the following: "The provisions of this act shall not apply to the parents and children of American citizens under 18 years of age."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Parents under 18 or children under 18?

Mr. SIEGEL. Parents alone and children under 18 years of age.

Mr. MADDEN. I suggest that the gentleman ought to change the language of his amendment. This applies to citizens under 18 years of age.

Mr. SIEGEL. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. SIEGEL) there were—ayes 9, noes 78.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Reserving the right to object, I should like to move that debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman move or ask unanimous consent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to see if I can get unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. SABATH. I have a very important amendment.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. It is necessary to put the question. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] that he may proceed for five minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am opposed to the bill now before this House for consideration for the reason that I believe the laws already on the statute books of the country, if properly enforced, are sufficient in themselves to protect our Republic from undesirable people who seek admission to our hospitable shores. Any further restrictions, it seems to me, would be un-American and would seriously work to the disadvantage of our country in the procuring of that element of labor so necessary to till the soil and develop the great industrial resources of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, if I should vote for this bill I would be false to the interests and ambitions of scores of thousands of the splendid people of the great State of Pennsylvania whom I in part have the honor to represent on the floor of this Chamber. Many people of the European races are now residents of my State, and they have splendidly proven their loyalty and devotion from the earliest days of our country's history down to the present moment. As President Roosevelt once said of one element of these people—the Irish—"they are hard workers in times of peace and splendid fighters in times of war."

And the same may be said of all of them, no matter from what land they came. The wonderful development of my own great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is a tribute to their industry and their skill, and I should be sorry to see any law placed upon the statutes of our country which would in any way prevent honest, decent, hard-working immigrants from seeking a home and a livelihood under the protecting folds of our starry banner of liberty.

The temporary idleness now prevalent in some sections of the country will, please God, soon pass away, and the time will come in the near future when from all sections there will be a demand for labor which can not be supplied unless it comes, as in the past, from European countries.

The tendency of the times is to get away from the land and to seek a living in the great cities of the country. Many of our young Americans do not seem to want to live upon the farms and cultivate them. Neither do young Americans seek to learn in any great numbers the mechanic arts so necessary in the development of our productive agencies of all kinds. Therefore, if we prevent immigration with stringent laws like the bill now before us we will seriously jeopardize our own interests and create a scarcity of labor in this country in a few years which will prove a serious menace to the future prosperity of our glorious land.

I trust this bill will fail to pass.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the many speeches for and against the general bill. I have heard the fears expressed by gentlemen here, and I wonder what they think the people who live in these other countries are seeking to come here for. I wonder if they think these people are longing to come here to blow up the Constitution and the institutions in this free land of ours? There is no such desire. I know that, because I am one of those referred to here. I came over thirty-odd years ago, and when I came there was no thought in my mind to do anything except to earn an honest living by the roughest kind of an implement that I could get my hands on to make a living. I am not pleading for the race from which I came. They need no pleading in this House; they are fighting their own cause in their own land in their own way, and may God speed them on the road to victory. The race from which I came helped to create our Revolution, helped in financing it, helped to win the victory, and we to-day, if it had not been for that victory, would be an annex to that Government that has annexed so many weak people. In conclusion let no man say that I oppose union labor or any kind of organized labor. I never have done that. I am a graduate of the schools of the great college of industry—the school of coal mining, the blacksmith and the machine shop and the rolling mills—and so I know whereof I speak. We should welcome all honest labor to our land, so that we shall continue to be the progressive nation that we always have been. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 7, strike out the words "or agreement."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which is proposed to this exception contained in the bill. That exception reads "aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration." My amendment is to strike out the words "or agreements," so that it will read "aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties relating solely to immigration."

I do not know just why these words "or agreements" are contained. I trust that in offering this amendment I am not playing with dynamite in any way, but I have a very firm conviction that that expression "or agreements" is one that would permit of international trouble arising under this law. May I ask the gentleman from Washington if it is not safer to leave it as "treaties"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think not. I hope we will not find it necessary to open up a great argument here to-night of the so-called gentleman's agreement whether they are in writing or a part of the treaty or verbal. In my opinion this will do no harm if these words are left in. We have no countries with which treaties are made relatively solely to immigration. We have immigration clauses in treaties, but no treaty relating solely to immigration.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think it is a serious fundamental proposition. Congress controls immigration, or ought to. This puts it in the power of the Executive alone to control that proposition without even a treaty being ratified by the Senate under the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would not the purpose of the gentleman be solved by leaving the language as it is and inserting the word "now?"

Mr. SABATH. Or say "present treaties."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That would be a decided improvement, but at the same time is it the purpose of the Congress to recognize some agreement that we know nothing absolutely about?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will allow me, I would suggest that what he wants to do is to strike out everything after the word "treaties" in that sentence. As the chairman of the committee [Mr. JOHNSON] suggests, there are no treaties specifically in regard to immigration.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But there may be treaties made in the future relating wholly to immigration, and there may be some now, I do not know. This bill is not only for the present but for the future. I think there ought to be a treaty relating to immigration.

Mr. LITTLE. There might be, but there is none now. If this language is left as it is made by your amendment we would not have any law, because there are no such treaties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If you strike out all the language after the word "treaties," he loses the word "solely."

Mr. LITTLE. I understand that, but if he wants it to read treaties relating solely to immigration you will have no law, because there are no such treaties. No exception to the provision of this section would be made by the clause he seeks to amend.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman know how many agreements there are in existence at this time?

Mr. LITTLE. I did not attempt to pursue that. I did not know that there were any.

Mr. BARKLEY. If there are no treaties that this language affects, and no agreements, why is it in there at all?

Mr. LITTLE. I think if we cut out everything after the word "treaties" we will have a good law. That is the way it probably ought to be. I do not know about any agreement anybody has made. I worked at that trade a little—some 28 years—and I never heard of any.

Mr. BARKLEY. There must be some, or they would not have provided for its exception.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. If I understand the gentleman, he thinks the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] would secure his object by simply striking out all after the word "treaties"?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes. If he does not do that, he will not have any law at all in this clause, because it would not apply to anything on earth.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The exception would be meaningless if it applied to treaties solely with reference to immigration, because there are no such treaties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And the 3 per cent would be meaningless, too.

Mr. LITTLE. I was in this treaty business myself for a little while once, but I never heard of any such "agreements."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do I understand the gentleman proposes to offer an amendment such as he suggested while I had the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No. I have had consultation since then, and it seems that at one time we did have the word "solely" in there, but I find that we took it out for this reason.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not mean the word "solely."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, the word "present." The bill provides:

Aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration.

If we put in the word "present" and as a result of this bill we lose agreements, where are we? We have got to carry this language. This is a temporary measure, and I am perfectly frank to come out in the open and say that it is designed to find out whether we do force the agreement to be actually recognized or not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean actually recognized by us or by some other country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Recognized in this way: That if any country elects to send people here to the extent of 3 per cent of their nationality in the country in 1910, then that act itself would violate any agreement that is in existence.

Then would come the making of a new treaty, and that would end in the preparation of future immigration laws the hanging about of this agreement in that way, interfering with the making of laws. I can not see that there can be any harm in this; I can not see that it will involve anyone. We have had pretty good advice on this, and after much consultation have gotten it in this shape.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I know there is a delicate situation about this, and I do not want to play with dynamite, but I do not like this idea of writing into this immigration law recognition of an agreement privately made and never carried through the form of a treaty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We do not specify in this any particular limit, but we do say that aliens coming from countries with which we have agreements relating solely to immigration—

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. Merely for the sake, I will not say clearness, but intelligibility of expression, does the gentleman not think he ought to say between whom the agreement exists?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That might be, but who has this agreement?

Mr. COCKRAN. Then, if the gentleman does not know, what in the name of patience does he mean by putting it into the bill and letting Congress and the rest of the world speculate as to its significance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I really believe that all interested parties will know, just the same.

Mr. COCKRAN. Surely the gentleman is not going to legislate on a belief that somebody will understand what we are legislating about?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman inform the House whether he expects to finish this bill and have a final vote upon it this evening?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is desired to get the bill up to the point where it may be voted on at the next session of the House.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out, at the end of line 17, page 2—

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is not in order; there is an amendment pending. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee) there were—yeas 40, nays 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment by striking out, at the end of line 17, page 2, section 2, the figure "3" and substituting therefor the figure "1."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIN: Page 2, line 17, strike out the figure "3" at the end of the line and insert in lieu thereof the figure "1."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not take the gentleman from Mississippi off of his feet by offering an amendment.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, my judgment is this bill is so loosely drawn that it will let in too many of these foreigners even with the seemingly low figure of 3 per cent. I would make it nothing if I thought we could get by with it, but I insist upon restricting them to 1 per cent of the number they already have within the borders and domain of the United States. If we are going to pass a bill to restrict immigration, let us pass one that means something. This measure is intended, so far as the public is concerned, to restrict immigration. The American people now realize that we have in all quarters of this country too many folks from across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans who have not become amalgamated with our people. Under this measure, who is coming? You are going to allow professors to come, and they may come in here with all their anti-American spirit, with the ideals of bolshevism, and all other dangerous isms, and demoralize the communities wherever they may go into. Who else is coming? Some gentleman said that we needed all kinds of labor to come here. According to the report of the Secretary of Labor you

already have 700,000 people who are idle. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], in his able argument here, said that we ought to have common labor to help this skilled labor and that to keep up prices of skilled labor we should import foreign labor. What are they going to do after they get here? From an economic standpoint the United States does not need any more. Every person who is familiar with the conditions in this country from a political standpoint knows that we do not need any professor or anybody else from across the ocean to come into the United States at this time. We already have as many foreigners here as the melting pot can melt, and, in my judgment, we have too many here already. These people endeavor to determine the political destiny of the United States. You remember in the last campaign it was discussed in the newspapers, by orators on the stump, in campaign headquarters, How will the Germans vote? How will the Scandinavian vote go? How will the Italian vote go? They ought to say, How will the Americans go? [Applause.] I am for the United States and for the American citizenship in heart, mind, and soul, to control this Government. I believe in America for Americans; first, last, and all the time.

Instead of us wanting to bring into this country snakes with poisonous fangs, that can be thrust into the body politic to send their poison from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, we should Americanize all of the people who are here now. We should not continue to let this foreign immigration come into this Republic. We have already too much unrest in this land, too much dissatisfaction with the Government. Gentlemen with crocodile tears in their eyes are talking apparently for the laboring men. I am always for the toiling masses getting a square deal. Where is the laboring men who wants to get this scum from Europe to come here? I say where is the laboring man who wants to bring somebody to be put in competition with him and take his job away from him? You know when you come with crocodile tears of pretense, talking against this bill and urging that the bars should be let down for all foreigners to come here, that the laboring people of the United States do not want to bring all these foreigners into competition with themselves, and you further know that the American—I mean the man who is really American in his heart and holds the flag of this Republic above all other flags of all other nations—does not want to bring into this country this horde that has been overrunning this land. You have in the cities of this Republic vast crowds now who can not speak the English language, and when the fate of the country is hanging in the balance on which side will they stand? Are they with us or are they against us?

The time has come when every American should be on guard. The Father of his Country, George Washington, the night he crossed the Delaware said: "Put none on guard but Americans." Now is the time for nothing but Americans to be put on guard. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: After the word "to" at the end of line 4, page 6, add the following:

"Wives, fiancées, parents, sisters, brothers, and minor children of ex-service men holding an honorable discharge from the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, who are eligible to citizenship and who served in the United States military or naval forces between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and to."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the House in its wisdom saw fit to defeat the amendment that was previously offered to exclude the families of service men from the 3 per cent regulation. This amendment simply gives preference to the families of ex-service men, and I do not think that I need to call your attention to it after hearing the discussion on the previous amendment, except to simply say that this does not increase the number of immigrants. I believe that is the reason that the other amendment was defeated, namely, that you were fearful that it would increase the number coming to this country. All we ask for now is that preference be given to our alien service men who are naturalized and who have families abroad. I believe that this House is not unmindful of what those soldiers did, and I believe you will not be ungrateful. It is only a small thing, and only a right, to say to our service men that these people should have preference over any others in coming to this country.

The guns have ceased firing and the bands have ceased playing on this side. But during the war the slogan that went all over this country and to the boys on the other side simply said this, "Nothing is too good for you when you return." And I regret as a service man that I have to call attention of the Congress to the fact that those words have received a substitute, and that substitute is, "The war is over." I do not think the Congress is willing, now that they have an opportunity to give this preference to service men, to turn them down. If they do, they must have some very good reason for it. The amendment that I have offered does not increase the immigration to this country by a single man, and I trust that it will prevail.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I am heartily in favor of the amendment which that gentleman has just offered. There is certainly in America to-day no body of citizens to which immigrants could come with greater assurance that their footsteps would be guided along the path of practical patriotism and worthy American citizenship than to those ex-service men who wore the uniform of the Army and Navy of our country in the recent great World War. One of the objections which has been raised, and quite properly so, to the coming of aliens to these shores at this particular time is that they will not become real American citizens. The ex-service men who went out, as my colleague has stated, to the call of arms went out with the assurance, voiced not only in print but spoken from the platforms throughout this Nation, that upon their return nothing would be too good for them. I do not believe, however, that the service men should have, nor that they ask for, anything that is not reasonable. The request which has been made and which is embodied in this amendment does not increase the number of immigrants that will come to our shores by one single individual. But it does give preferential treatment to the relatives of these ex-service men of foreign birth; who offered so freely their lives, and in so doing gave such sterling proof of their love for their adopted country in its hour of crisis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Gentlemen, I do not believe that there is anything more fitting than that this House should recognize the desire on the part of those patriotic American citizens of foreign birth—who have so unquestionably proven their devotion to American ideals and institutions—to be united with their families and their relatives from across the seas, and that we should so amend this bill that this legitimate and worthy aspiration may be gratified. I certainly hope that this amendment will carry. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can make an arrangement under which this amendment can be considered as pending and passed over for the present. I am inclined to think it can be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York be passed over without prejudice and be taken up later in the session of the committee. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand the request of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to say to the gentleman that I want to consult with other members of the committee with a view to accepting the amendment. I desire to make it sure that it is in the proper place and that these phrases may not conflict with other provisions of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I want to get the assurance of the gentleman that we shall have an opportunity to take this matter up and be notified when it will come up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; it will be considered pending. If the gentleman is not here to watch it, I will watch it for him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment: On page 6, after the word "further," in line 3, strike out all down to and including the word "law," in line 8, and insert the following:

The provisions of this act shall not apply to the minor children, if free from contagious disease and otherwise admissible under the immigration laws of the United States, of citizens of the United States; and preference shall be given so far as possible to the parents, wives, and minor children of aliens who are now in the United States and have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: On page 6, after the word "further," in line 3, strike out all down to and including the word "law," in line 8, and insert the following: "The provisions of this act shall not apply to the minor children, if free from contagious disease and otherwise admissible under the immigration laws of the United States; and preference shall be given so far as possible to the parents, wives, and minor children of aliens who are now in the United States and have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For the purpose of moving that the committee do now rise.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman when we shall meet again? When the committee reassembles shall I have the right to be recognized on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STAFFORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 4075, to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LEATHERWOOD was granted leave of absence, for four days, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HIMES was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Joseph W. Bevard, H. R. 5110, first session Sixty-sixth Congress, and David Turnipseed, H. R. 5115, first session Sixty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 22, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

43. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and plan and estimate of cost of improvement of inland waterway from Pensacola Bay, Fla., to Mobile Bay, Ala.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

44. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of shore near the mouth of Saco River, Me., with a view to preventing its erosion; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

45. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of outlet of Cass Lake, Minn., with a view to establishing a navigable connection with the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

46. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Michigan City Harbor, Ind. (H. Doc. No. 20); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

47. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$110,000 required by the Treasury Department to cover printing and binding, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 21); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

48. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$8,790,272 required by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 22); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

49. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$175,000 to cover printing and binding for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 23); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IRELAND, from the Committee on Accounts, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) providing for pay to clerks to Members of Congress and Delegates, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 10), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3071) granting an increase of pension to Eva Bassett; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 507) granting a pension to Marianne H. D'Arcy; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 511) granting an increase of pension to Isabel Bertrand; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FUNK: A bill (H. R. 4783) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bloomington, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4784) to protect the name and insignia of the World War organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 4785) to relieve the owners of mining claims, or the heirs of said owners, who served as officers or enlisted men in the military or naval forces of the United States or, if now an American citizen, in the armed forces of any of the nations associated with the United States during the recent war with Germany, from performing assessment work for a period of five years from and after the 1st day of July, 1921; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4786) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to, cold-storage foods; to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 4787) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MILLS: A bill (H. R. 4788) to provide for the appointment of one additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4789) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Brinkley, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4790) to provide for the erection of a public building at Walnut Ridge, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4791) to provide for the erection of a public building at Clarendon, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 4792) to provide for reimbursement of steamship companies and others for advancements made during the late war to officers and enlisted men of the naval service on account of pay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 4793) to extend the limits of Shiloh National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4794) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Tombigbee River in the State of Mississippi and in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4795) for the improvement of the Federal building at Aberdeen, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4796) to prohibit in the District of Columbia the intermarriage of whites with Negroes or Mongolians; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4797) to refund to lawful claimants the cotton tax collected for the years 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALTERS: A bill (H. R. 4798) for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4799) granting pensions to certain members of the former Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 4800) making armistice day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H. R. 4801) to amend section 206 (c) of an act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 4802) fixing the compensation of the United States customs guards and night inspectors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4803) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 4804) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Minden, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4805) to consolidate national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4806) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the ninth congressional district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4807) granting additional pay to the enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) to authorize deduction of war-risk insurance premiums from the war-service bonus payable under the act approved February 24, 1919, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 4809) to amend sections 8 and 9 of the Panama Canal act, to regulate divorce in the Canal Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 4810) to authorize the incorporation of companies to promote trade in China; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4811) providing for the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) to provide for the disposal of public lands in Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah containing deposits of copper at depth; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) changing the period for doing annual assessment work on unpatented mineral claims from the calendar year to the fiscal year ending June 30 of each year; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 4814) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, to include members of the Regular Army Reserve and the Naval Reserve Force in the civil service preference therein provided; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4815) to amend section 9 of the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 4816) to provide a tariff and to obtain revenue in connection with the lead content of lead-bearing ores, lead, and lead products, and repealing existing laws fixing the rates of duty on such commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4817) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Jefferson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Canton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Buford, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Toccoa, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Commerce, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4822) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Lawrenceville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4823) to construct a suitable building for the use of the United States court at Gainesville, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 4824) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in suits against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 4825) for the relief of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4826) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended May 15, 1916, and May 26, 1920; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) for the relief of cyclone sufferers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) for a commission to review the foreign debt to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) authorizing the appointment of a commission to confer with the Dominion Government or the provincial governments of Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick as to certain restrictive orders in council of the said Provinces relative to the exportation of pulp wood therefrom to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Resolution (H. J. Res. 69) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) requesting the President of the United States to enter into negotiations for amendment of treaty with Great Britain relating to boundary waters between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALMON: Resolution (H. Res. 65) providing for printing additional copies of soil survey of Lauderdale County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania favoring retirement privileges for disabled emergency officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. APPLEBY: A bill (H. R. 4827) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bradley Beach, State of New Jersey, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4828) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Cranbury, State of New Jersey, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4829) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of North Fairfield, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4830) granting an increase of Pension to John T. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4831) to pay to J. H. White \$2,000 for injuries received at the hands of two United States soldiers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4832) for the relief of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4833) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Christy, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 4834) to compensate Levi Buckner for the time he was omitted from the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 4835) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie K. Thorpe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 4836) granting a pension to Mary E. Feenan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 4837) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Scanlan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) for the relief of Faxon, Horton & Gallagher, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 4839) granting an increase of pension to Isabelle Barnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 4840) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Canton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4841) granting a pension to Albert E. Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 4842) granting a pension to Margaret Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 4843) granting a pension to Mary Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4844) for the relief of Jonathan J. Totten; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) for the relief of J. W. La Bare; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Blackburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 4847) granting a pension to Emma Schuette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) granting a pension to Claud Dever; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 4849) granting a pension to Elizabeth Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4850) for the relief of Eli G. Collier; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4851) for the relief of Patrick O'Kane; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) for the relief of the heirs of Lovick Lambeth, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) for the relief of the heirs of Simon Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) for the relief of the heirs of Peter Goodman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Pennington; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) for the relief of the heirs of Augusta W. Diehl, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) for the relief of the estate of Jeremiah Cockrell, late of White Oak, Fairfield County, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 4858) granting a pension to Alfred Hayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) granting a pension to Mary H. Lauderbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 4860) for the relief of Caleb Aber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 4861) to reimburse the California Shipbuilding Co. for its expenditures over the price named in the contract for the United States lighthouse tender *Cedar*; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of George W. C. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4863) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Arthur H. Fish; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4864) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John W. Westover; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4865) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTROYA: A bill (H. R. 4866) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4867) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Old Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Las Vegas, State of New Mexico, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roswell, State of New Mexico, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Las Cruces, State of New Mexico, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4872) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Canastota, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Natural Bridge, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSEN: A bill (H. R. 4874) for the relief of William V. Nolan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 4875) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. McClane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) granting an increase of pension to Mary Neal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 4877) granting a pension to Ella E. Carbonell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4878) for the relief of the father of Catharine Kearney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 4879) for the relief of Mamie Duffer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) to provide for the survey of the Tombigbee River in Alabama and Mississippi, and the survey of a canal connecting the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROSENBLOOM: A bill (H. R. 4881) granting a pension to Mary C. Wykoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 4882) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Chelsea Park, city of New York, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4883) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the DeWitt Clinton Park, city of New York, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 4884) granting a pension to Sarah J. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 4885) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 4886) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel G. Cherry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS: A bill (H. R. 4887) granting an increase of pension to Ella Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4888) for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4889) granting a pension to John B. Sarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 4890) for the relief of Ella Edmondson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOLK: A bill (H. R. 4891) for the relief of Thomas Steenworth; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4892) for the relief of James A. McErlain; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4893) granting a pension to Mary E. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 4894) for the relief of George W. Posey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

232. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition of 400 members of the Maumee River Yacht Club, asking repeal of 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

233. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Women's Municipal League of New York, favoring further legislation for disabled

veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

234. By Mr. DYER: Petition of American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, demanding that our Government take the necessary steps to compel the Government of Great Britain to pay its debts to the people of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

235. Also, petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of light wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

236. Also, petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of a repeal of the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

237. By Mr. FUNK: Petition by the Irish Societies of Bloomington, Ill., that the shooting of the six Irishmen is a violation of The Hague convention of 1907, and protesting against further outrages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

238. Also, petition of the Bloomington-Normal (Ill.) Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, protesting against the crime of lynching and requesting that a law be enacted making such crime a Federal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

239. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging retention of passport offices in New York; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

240. Also, resolutions of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging prompt repeal of odious taxation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

241. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of American Legion, recommending legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

242. Also, petition of Keystone Local, No. 63, of Pitscain, Pa., favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

243. Also, petition of Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, favoring defensive measures in tariff against countries discriminating against American products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

244. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, opposing opening of trade relations with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

245. By Mr. KENNEDY: Resolution of Board of Aldermen of the city of Newport, R. I., protesting against the removal of the Naval War College from Newport; also resolution of Board of Aldermen, Newport, R. I., urging reestablishment of second naval district at Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

246. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of J. S. Otis, of New Orleans, favoring reduction in interest rates; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

247. Also, petition of T. F. Van Dorn, of New York, favoring House bill 2450; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

248. Also, petition of Women's Municipal League of New York, favoring further relief for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

249. Also, petition of Laurence Lowery, of New York, favoring recognition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

250. Also, petition of Samstag's, Schwartz Bros. and Oscar H. Geiger & Co., all of New York, favoring 1 per cent sales tax; also petition of Kruskal & Kruskal (Inc.), of New York, protesting against 10 per cent tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

251. By Mr. PARK of Georgia: Petition of W. L. Hanna and eight other residents of Tifton, Ga., asking reduction in freight rates on watermelons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

252. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of numerous citizens of the fifth district of Massachusetts favoring recognition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

253. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petitions of Vesper Chapter, No. 92, Order of Eastern Star, and Meridian Lodge No. 116, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, both of Hazen, N. Dak., and Willow Lodge No. 47, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, Willow City, N. Dak., indorsing Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

254. Also, petition of Mott Lodge No. 96, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, Mott, N. Dak., and Mandan Lodge No. 8, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, Mandan, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

255. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of board of aldermen of the city of Newport, R. I., protesting against the contemplated removal of the Navy War College from Newport to Washington and urging the reestablishment of the second naval district; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

256. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of South Boston Yacht Club, of South Boston, Mass., favoring the repeal of 10 per cent tax on pleasure craft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

257. By Mr. VARE: Petition of vessel owners and captains association against Government operation of inland barges, provided for in the transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

258. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Samuel C. Osborn Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, protesting against an excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

259. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition adopted by Mandan Lodge No. 8, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, of Mandan, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill, to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

260. Also, petition of Lodge No. 7, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, of Valley City, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

261. Also, petition of Willow Lodge, No. 47, Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons, of Willow City, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 22, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, O God, do we give our thanks, for in Thy hand do we live and move and have our being. Thou art a sun and a shield. Thou wilt give grace and glory, and no good thing wilt Thou withhold from them that walk uprightly. When the experiences of life come hard, and the head is bowed and the heart is heavy and the way is rough and long, bestow great strength and sweet peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. Any Members elect desiring to take the oath of office will now present themselves.

Mr. JAMES M. MEAD, Representative elect from the forty-second district of New York, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, under the special order I ask to be recognized for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to address the House for 25 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was agreed that if we had not completed the immigration bill the gentleman would not press the special order.

Mr. POU. Oh, no; the understanding was that if a vote was imminent I would not insist upon it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me say frankly to the gentleman that I am very anxious to hear him, and I think a very large part of the membership are anxious to hear him, and if he will defer his remarks I think we can have a vote prior to 3 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to the floor, if he desires it.

Mr. MONDELL. Just a moment. My understanding was that the gentleman from North Carolina was not to speak until this bill was finished.

Mr. POU. Oh, no; that was not the understanding.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with very great reluctance that I refrained from objecting to this special order. The situation now emphasizes the objectionable feature of such orders. There are many Members who desire to conclude consideration of this bill early to-day. It is highly important that we should conclude its consideration to-day. The gentleman can make his speech just as well after the bill is disposed of, and if he does it will accommodate very many gentlemen on both sides who are anxious to have this bill concluded at the very earliest possible moment.

Mr. POU. The gentleman from Wyoming knows perfectly well that in all human probability this bill can not be concluded within the next two or three hours.

Mr. MONDELL. I think it can be concluded before 3 o'clock without unduly pressing its consideration.

Mr. POU. Certainly 25 minutes will not unduly delay its passage.

Mr. MONDELL. We hope to dispose of it by that time. There are quite a number of gentlemen on both sides who will be seriously inconvenienced if there is any great delay in the passage of the bill to-day. The gentleman can just as well make his statement and we will all be here and listen to it after the bill is disposed of; and I will say again, Mr. Speaker, that my understanding was that the gentleman should follow the consideration of this bill if the bill went over until to-day.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair recollects, the gentleman from Washington made the suggestion that if we had finished the debate on the bill and the vote was to be taken immediately after the reading of the Journal, the gentleman should postpone his remarks until after the vote was taken.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, if the gentleman wants to insist, and create a situation under which in the future we must object to all of these special orders, he may do it.

Mr. POU. The gentleman can object if he wants to, but I am not going to surrender my rights under any such circumstances as these. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th day of this month an article appeared in the Washington Post, of which I ask the Clerk to read the marked portion.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOUTHERNERS HEAD HOUSE DEMOCRATS—MINORITY COMMITTEE PLACES ASSIGNED, WITH GARRETT ACTING FLOOR LEADER—REPLACE OTHER MEMBERS—ROSTER TAKEN TO MEAN WILSON MEN REGARD SOUTH AS STRONGHOLD FOR PARTY'S FUTURE.

(By the Associated Press.)

The claim by leaders that the South still is the backbone of the Democratic Party was indicated yesterday in the organization of standing committees of the House.

Except in two instances, and counting Kentucky and Missouri as part of the old Democratic stronghold, a southern Representative was named as ranking minority member of all committees.

This means, according to leaders, that if the Democrats should capture the House two years hence its machinery would be controlled wholly by the South. On many committees a southern Member also stood next to the ranking Democrat, and in some cases all minority members, in the list approved and selected, hail from Southern States.

MANY CHANGES MADE.

Many changes were made in some of the big committees, Representatives from the South taking the places formerly held by Democrats from other sections. There was a big rush for the Committee on Appropriations, but all aspirants could not be accommodated.

Representative GARRETT, of Tennessee, named by the Democrats as acting leader, already has taken over the work of the floor. Representative KITCHIN, of North Carolina, the Democratic leader, also is ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, which requires most of his time. Moreover, he is trying to conserve his strength after long absence due to illness, and it was at his request that Mr. GARRETT was made acting leader.

Four southern Democrats were elected to fill vacancies on the Judiciary Committee, which must handle legislation affecting prohibition.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, a report like that, going out through the Associated Press, ought not to pass unexplained, because it does a very grievous injustice to the section from which I come.

According to that statement, it would appear that certain gentlemen have been displaced from certain committees of the House and that their places have been taken by southern Democrats. As a matter of fact, there has been no such displacing of anybody. There are in this House 131 Democrats, and of that number about 20 come from States which are not a part of the so-called solid South. I have examined the record, and these gentlemen not only have no complaint to make, but they are burdened with work. I am going to read a list of the 21 Members who come from Northern or Western States, and their committee assignments:

HAYDEN, of Arizona, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, and Irrigation of Arid Lands.

LEA, of California, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RAKER, of California, Public Lands, Woman Suffrage, Irrigation of Arid Lands, and Immigration and Naturalization.

TAYLOR, of Colorado, Appropriations and Select Committee on Budget.

RAINEY, of Illinois, Agriculture.

SABATH, of Illinois, Foreign Affairs and Immigration and Naturalization.

KUNZ, of Illinois, Invalid Pensions, District of Columbia, and Mileage.

GOLDSBOROUGH, of Maryland, Banking and Currency, Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, and Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

LINTHICUM, of Maryland, Foreign Affairs.